This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

MANUAL

OF

Universal Church History.

BY THE

REV. DR. JOHN ALZOG,
Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg.

TRANSLATED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE NINTH AND LAST GERMAN EDITION,

BY

F. J. PABISCH,
Doctor of Theology, of Canon and of Civil Law, President of the Provincial Seminary of Mount St. Mary's of the West, Cincinnati, O.

AND

Rev. THOS. S. BYRNE,
Professor at Mount St. Mary's Seminary.

In Three Volumes.

WITH THREE CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES AND THREE ECCLESIASTICO-GEOGRAPHICAL MAPS.

VOLUME II.

CINCINNATI, O.
ROBERT CLARKE & CO.
1876.

Entered, according to act of Congress, in the year 1876, by
ROBERT CLARKE & CO.,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Stereotyped by OGDEN, CAMPBELL & Co., Cincinnati.

PREFACE.

THE second volume of the translation of Dr. Alzog's Universal Church History, like the first, enjoys the sanction of the proper ecclesiastical authorities. The translators take this occasion to thank many prelates of the country for their cordial approbation; and reviewers, Catholic and non-Catholic, at home and abroad, for their judicious notices and words of encouragement.

Much will of course be said of the bulk of the present volume, but no one can be more alive to the fact than the translators themselves, or more sincerely wish the pages were fewer than they are. Under the circumstances it could not be otherwise. First of all, the work of editing has been far more extensive and laborious in this than the preceding volume. While conscientiously careful not to omit a single sentence of the original, the translators have introduced much that is wholly new, from reliable sources, relating chiefly to countries where the English language is spoken, and in some sections—as, for instance, in that treating of the British Isles—have used the text only as an outline for their guidance. The labor which such additions unavoidably entailed, will, in a measure, account for the delay in bringing out the book.

Again, the author has himself made very important changes and considerable additions in the later German editions of his history, which are now reproduced for the first time in a translation. In preparing his eighth edition Dr. Alzog entirely recast his former text-book of one volume, added much new matter, partially improved the faults of brevity and obscurity in his sentences by the employment of a more copious diction, and issued the work as a *Manual* in *two* volumes. In the ninth edition he made similar improvements, both as to matter and form, many portions being not only revised, but entirely rewritten.

The fourth and last edition of the French translation by Goeschler and Audley, edited by Abbé *Sabatier*, and published in 1874–75, is, as far as the French Revolution, based on the *seventh* German, and from 1789 to our own time on the *eighth*, which appeared respectively in 1859 and 1867. The English translation is the only one made on the *ninth* and last German edition, published at Mentz in 1872, and contains, moreover, the latest additions and amendments of the author, which he was kind enough to send the translators in September last, and which include the latest historical researches. The author has also promised to send others in time to be embodied in the next volume.

It may be well to state here that Dr. Alzog has given this translation his fullest approbation, has generously foregone the privileges of his copyright, and allowed the work to be put on sale in Great Britain and Ireland.

Lest any one should think that the translators are inclined to put too high an estimate on Dr. Alzog's work, it may be well to quote here what has been said of it by Dr. Kraus, himself the author of an excellent Church History,[1] and therefore entitled to speak with some authority. "Since Döllinger's Text-book," says he (Ch. Hist., Preface), "is incomplete, and Ritter's Manual has, in a great measure, grown obsolete, the only available book we have now is Dr. Alzog's Manual and Abridgment of Church History." They may furthermore add that they have been most conscientious as to the truth of every statement made, whether in the original or in their own additions, and have in *no instance* rested content with anything short of absolute accuracy where this was possible. "To arrive at truth," says a distinguished modern writer,[1] "is the object, the duty—nay, the joy—of the historian. Once he has found it, he admires its dignity, appreciates its convenience—because it alone clears up all difficulties—never ceases to pursue and love it, and constantly aims at portraying it or something which he mistakes for it." Such also has been their aim and recompense. Any other policy would be dishonest and fraught with disaster. These are serious times; there are only two camps and two standards in the intellectual and religious world now. Under the one are ranged the defenders; under the other, the enemies of the Church, for those who are not with her are against her. The eyes of all, friends and foes alike, are turned toward those centuries which it is the custom to call the Middle or Dark Ages, whose history, traditions, and institutions modern scientists, because they fear their influence, affect to despise. But, for good or for evil, their history is being studied and studied thoroughly. Is it not, therefore, the highest duty, as well as the highest wisdom of the historian, to tell the naked, unvarnished truth about them? Is it honest, is it profitable, to conceal disagreeable facts—facts which, though humiliating, are far better told frankly by a friend than openly paraded and misrepresented by an enemy? Such has been the course pursued in this history. The truth has been plainly spoken, without addition and without diminution, irrespective of whom it may benefit or harm. "Ought history," asks Père Lacordaire, "hide the faults of men and orders? It was not," he replies, "in this sense that *Baronius* understood his duty as an historian of the Church. It was not after this fashion the Saints laid open the scandals of their times. Truth, when discreetly told," he continues, "is an inestimable boon to mankind, and to suppress it, especially in history, is an act of cowardice unworthy a Christian. Timidity is the fault of our age, and truth is concealed under pretense of respect for holy things. Such concealment serves neither God nor man. God indeed has conferred upon His Church the prerogative of infalliiblity, but to none of her members has He granted immunity from sin. Peter was a sinner and a renegade, and God has been at pains to have the fact recorded in the Gospel."[1]

---

[1] Dr. *F. X. Kraus*, Text-book of Ch. H., 3 vols., Treves, 1872–1875.

---

[1] M. *Thiers*, Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, Vol. XVI., p. 418.

Dr. Alzog by no means merits the rebuke conveyed in these indignant words, and the Church will be no loser by his honesty. She is the house of the living God, the pillar and groundwork of the truth, the source of all holiness, and in these she is without spot or blemish. Her faithless children may indeed be a reproach to her, as they have been in every age, but once history has shown that in ceasing to be obedient to her teaching and her precepts they have also ceased to be loyal to the highest principles of Christianity, and the noblest instincts of our manhood, her victory will be complete and her triumph glorious.

THE TRANSLATORS.

MOUNT ST. MARY'S OF THE WEST,
FEAST OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, A. D. 1875.

---

[1] Lettre du Père *Lacordaire* à l'abbé Perreyve, 2 avril, 1855. *Foisset*, Vie du P. L. II. 532.

SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

SECOND PERIOD.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH PREDOMINANT AMONG THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC NATIONS—SHE CONVERTS THEM TO CHRISTIANITY, AND CIVILIZES THEM—HER HISTORY TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

§ 144. Character of the Roman Catholic Church during the Present Period 1

First Epoch—*From the Migration of the Germanic and Slavic Nations to the Pontificate of Gregory VII.*, A. D. 1073. *Foundation of the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Middle Ages.*

PART FIRST.

From the Fourth Century to the Death of Charlemagne, A. D. 814.

§ 145. Sources and Works 12
146. Religion of the Germans 13
147. Religious Belief of the Germans in Scandinavia 17

CHAPTER I. *Propagation of Christianity.*

§ 148. Among the Goths 20
149. Christianity among the Visigoths—Their Kingdoms in Gaul and Spain 24
150. The Vandals in Africa 26
151. The Burgundians and their Relations to the Church 30
152. Ravages of the Huns in Germany, Gaul, and Italy 31
153. The Ostrogoths and Lombards in Italy 33
154. Benedict of Nursia—Western Monasticism 40
155. Christianity among the Franks—Triumph of Catholicity 46

§ 156. Christianity in the British Isles.......... 50
157. Christianity in Germany and the adjacent Countries.......... 96
158. Christianity among the Frisians—Reverses of the Christians in Spain.......... 109
159. Labors of St. Boniface.......... 112
160. The Conversion of the Saxons.......... 120

CHAPTER II. *Modifications in the Relations and Organization of the Church.*

§ 161. The Church in her Relations to the Germanic States—Close Alliance of Church and State.......... 125
162. Enlarged Possessions of the Church.......... 130
163. Increased Dependence of the Church upon the State—Administration of Metropolitan and Diocesan Sees.......... 132
164. The Primacy—Spiritual Power of the Popes.......... 138
165. Temporal Power of the Popes—Establishment of the States of the Church.......... 141
166. Foundation of the Christian German, or Restoration of the Roman Empire of the West.......... 147

CHAPTER III. *Religious Life—The Clergy—Discipline.*

§ 167. Religious Life.......... 153
168. The Clergy—Their Canonical Life—The Monks.......... 156
169. Penance and Discipline.......... 162

CHAPTER IV. *Scientific Labors of the Germans.*

§ 170. General Character of Science during this Epoch.......... 167
171. Progress of Science in Italy, Spain, and the British Isles.......... 167
172. Labors of Charlemagne for the Diffusion of Knowledge.......... 171
173. First Heresies—Adelbert and Clement—Adoptionism.......... 174
174. Charlemagne.......... 182

CHAPTER V. *The Greek Church.*

§ 175. General View.......... 189
176. Mohammed—His Doctrine—Its Rapid Progress.......... 191
177. The Controversies of the Iconoclasts in the East and in the Frankish Empire.
A.—Byzantine Iconoclasts.......... 206
B.—The Iconoclastic Controversy in the Frankish Empire. 218

PART SECOND.

History of the Catholic Church from the Death of Charlemagne to the Pontificate of Gregory VII., 1073.

§ 178. Sources—Works 223

CHAPTER I. *Progress of Christianity among the Germans—Conversion of Slavic Nations.*

§ 179. Christianity in Scandinavia 224
180. The Slavonians and their Mythology 235
181. Conversion of some of the Slavonic Nations 238
182. Conversion of the Poles 246
183. Christianity in Hungary 250

HAPTER II. *The Papacy and the Empire.*

§ 184. Summary 253

A.—The Popes under the Carlovingians.

185. Under Louis the Mild and his Sons 254
186. Progress of the Power of the Popes from A. D. 855 to 880—False Decretals of Isidore 268

B.—Deplorable Condition of the Papacy in the Tenth Century.

187. The Roman Pontificate during its disgraceful Dependence upon Tuscan Domination 292

C.—The Papacy after the Restoration of the Empire.

188. The Popes under the Saxon Emperors 298
189. The Popes under the Franconian Emperors 315
190. Continuation—Popes elected through the Influence of Hildebrand 320
191. Retrospect 334

CHAPTER III. *History of the Constitution of the Church.*

§ 192. The Church in her Relations to the State 337
193. Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Popes 342
194. The College of Cardinals 344
195. Metropolitans, Bishops, and their Dioceses 348
196. Church Property 354
197. Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction—Immunities of the Clergy 356

CHAPTER IV. *Religious Life—Worship—Discipline.*

§ 198. The Morals of the Clergy........ 357
199. Religious Orders of this Epoch........ 359
200. Condition of the Church in the Leading Countries of Europe. 366
201. Religious Worship during this Epoch........ 394
202. Ecclesiastical Discipline........ 405

CHAPTER V. *Theological Science and Heresies.*

§ 203. Theological Literature—Works and their Authors........ 421
204. New Controversy on Predestination, occasioned by the Teachings of Gottschalk........ 425
205. First Controversy on the Eucharist—Paschasius Radbert........ 430
206. Second Controversy on the Eucharist, occasioned by the Writings of Berengarius of Tours........ 441

CHAPTER VI. *Memorable Events in the Greek Church.*

§ 207. Eastern Schism—Photius—Eighth Ecumenical Council........ 449
208. Revival of the Schism by Michael Cerularius........ 462
209. Learning among the Greeks........ 466
210. Conversion of the Chazari, Bulgarians, and Russians by the Greeks........ 468
211. Sects of the Eastern and Western Churches........ 473
212. Retrospect........ 475

SECOND EPOCH.

FROM GREGORY VII. (A. D. 1073) TO THE OPENING OF THE WESTERN SCHISM, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY—THE PAPACY IN THE MIDDLE AGES—HEIGHT AND DECLINE OF ITS POWER.

PART FIRST.

Rise and Height of the Papal Power in the Middle Ages, from the Accession of Gregory VII. to the Death of Boniface VIII. (A. D. 1073–1303.)

§ 213. Outline—Sources, and Works referring to them........ 477

CHAPTER I. *History of the Papacy.*

A.—From Gregory VII. to Calixtus II.—From the Beginning of the Contest on Investitures until its Termination by the Concordat of Worms (A. D. 1122).

§ 214. Pope Gregory VII. (A. D. 1073–1085)........ 481
215. Victor III. (A. D. 1087)—Urban II. (A. D. 1088–1099)........ 511

§ 216. The Crusades........ 517
217. Paschal II. (A. D. 1099–1118)—Gelasius II. (A. D. 1119)—Calixtus II. (A. D. 1119–1124)........ 523
Ninth Ecumenical Council (A. D. 1123)........ 536

B.—From Honorius to the Death of Eugene III. (A. D. 1153)—*Italian Republicanism—Arnold of Brescia—Second Crusade—St. Bernard and his Work, "De Consideratione."*

§ 218. Honorius II. (A. D. 1124–1130)—Innocent II. (A. D. 1130–1143)—Lucius II. (A. D. 1144–1145)—Eugenius III. (A. D. 1145–1153)........ 538

C.—The Hundred Years Struggle between the Popes and Hohenstaufens—Frederic I., Henry VI., Frederic II., Conrad IV., and Conradin († A. D. 1268).

§ 219. Hadrian IV. (A. D. 1155–1159)—Alexander III. (A. D. 1159–1181)—Frederic I., and Henry II., King of England—Thomas à Becket........ 547
Pope Hadrian's Bull concerning Ireland........ 554
Eleventh Ecumenical Council (1179)........ 568
220 Lucius III. (A. D. 1181–1185)—Urban III. (A. D. 1185–1187)—Gregory VIII. (A. D. † 1187)—Clement III. (A. D. 1187–1191)—Celestine III. (A. D. 1191–1198)—Frederic I.—Henry VI... 569
221. Innocent III.—His Relations to the Princes of Europe........ 573
Twelfth Ecumenical Council (A. D. 1215)........ 583
222. Honorius III. (1216–1227)—Gregory IX. (1227–1241)—Innocent IV. (1243–1254)—Clement IV. (1265–1268) in opposition to Frederic II., Conrad IV., and Conradin, last scion of the House of Suabia........
223. Crusades of St. Louis (IX.)—Pragmatic Sanction........ 600

D.—Beginning of French Influence—Tardiness of Papal Elections.

224. Gregory X. (A. D. 1271–1276)—Council of Lyons—Death of St. Thomas Aquinas and of St. Bonaventure—Rudolph of Hapsburg........ 604
225. The Popes from Innocent V. (A. D. 1276) until the Abdication of Celestine V. (A. D. 1294)........ 607
226. Boniface VIII. (A. D. 1294–1303)—Philip IV., King of France.. 614
227. General View of the Temporal and Spiritual Power of the Popes during the Middle Ages........ 630

CHAPTER II. *The Other Members of the Hierarchy—Administration of Dioceses.*

§ 228. The Clergy in their Relations to the State.......... 640
229. The Cardinals.......... 644
230. Administration of Dioceses.......... 646
231. The Morals of the Clergy.......... 648
232. Church Property.......... 650

CHAPTER III. *Fanatical and Refractory Sects.*

§ 233. General View.......... 652
234. Tanchelm, Eon, Peter of Bruis, Henry of Lausanne, and the Passagians.......... 654
235. The Waldenses.......... 658
236. The Cathari and the Albigenses.......... 661
237. Remarks on the rigorous Measures employed against these Sects.......... 667
238. Amalric of Bena—David of Dinanto—Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit—Apostolic Brethren.......... 672

CHAPTER IV. *History of Religious Orders.*

§ 239. Introduction.......... 681
240. The Cistercian Order.......... 683
241. The Order of Grammont.......... 688
242. The Carthusians.......... 689
243. The Premonstratensians.......... 692
244. The Carmelites and the Order of Fontevrault.......... 694
245. Anthonists, Trinitarians, and Humiliati.......... 697
246. The three great Military and Religious Orders.......... 700
247. Mendicant Orders—St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi..... 707
248. Influence of the Mendicant Orders—Opposition raised against them.......... 719
249. Divisions among the Franciscans.......... 721
250. Other Orders and Confraternities.......... 723
The True Picture of Monastic Life.......... 725

CHAPTER V. *History of Theological Science.*

§ 251. Transformation of Cloister and Cathedral Schools into Universities.......... 728
252. Scholasticism and Mysticism.......... 732
253. St. Anselm of Canterbury.......... 740

Controversy on Realism, Nominalism, and Conceptualism...... 742
§ 254. Controversy concerning Scholasticism and Mysticism—Abelard, Gilbertus Porretanus, and St. Bernard........................ 746
255. Attempts to check the Vagaries of Speculation—Robert Pulleyne, Peter Lombard, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor.. 754
256. The Mystics.. 762
257. Second Period of Scholasticism under the Franciscans and Dominicans 765
258. The Other Sciences—Religious Poets—National Literature..... 784

CHAPTER VI. *Religious and Moral Life—Penitential Discipline—Propagation of Christianity.*

§ 259. Religious and Moral Life 790
260. Penitential Discipline—Jubilee Indulgences........................ 795
261. Conversion of Pomerania and the Island of Rügen...... 800
262. Conversion of Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland.................... 802
263. Christianity in Prussia.. 803
264. Conversion of the Mongols by Western Missionaries............ 806
The Greek Church.. 810

PART SECOND.

From the Death of Boniface VIII. to the Western Schism (A. D. 1303–1517) *—Decline of Mediaeval Papal Supremacy—Transition to its Condition in Modern Times—Reformatory Councils.*

§ 265. Literature—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.. 816

CHAPTER I. *Constitution of the Church as regards her Exterior Development.*

A.—The Popes of Avignon, or the Babylonian Captivity (1309–1378).

§ 266. Translation of the Holy See to Avignon—Benedict XI. —Clement V.. 819
Fifteenth Ecumenical Council.. 826
267. John XXII.—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—Struggle with Louis the Bavarian.. 829
268. Innocent VI.—Bl. Urban V.—Gregory XI............................ 838

B.—Great Western Schism (A. D. 1378–1417 and 1439–1449)*—Popes at Rome and at Avignon—Reformatory Synods of Pisa, Constance, and Basle.*

§ 269. Urban VI.—Boniface IX.—Innocent VII.—Gregory XII....... 845
270. Council of Pisa (1409)—Alexander V.—John XXIII........... 853

§ 271. The Council of Constance (1414–1418) 858
272. Eugene IV.—Nicholas V.—The Council of Basle; its Protest against being transferred to Ferrara and Florence—Emperor Sigismund—Albert II.—Frederic III 874

C.—The Last Popes of this Period—Fifth Council of Lateran.

273. Calixtus III.—Pius II.—Paul II.—Sixtus IV.—Innocent VIII. —Alexander VI 897
274. Julius II.—Synod of Pisa—Fifth Council of Lateran—Leo X. 914
275. Review of the Situation of the Papacy 922
276. Review of the Condition of the other Members of the Hierarchy 926
277. Morals of the Clergy 928
278. Negotiations with the Greek Church for a Restoration of Union—Seventeenth Ecumenical Council at Ferrara and Florence 931

CHAPTER II. *Heresies and Heretical Sects.*

§ 279. John Wickliffe (A. D. 1324–1384) 947
280. John Huss (1373–1415)—The Hussites 952
The Hussite Wars 967
281. German Theology 971
282. The Heretics, John Wesel, and John van Goch, and the Zealots, John Wessel, and Jerome Savonarola 973
283. The Inquisition 979

CHAPTER III. *Ecclesiastical Science.*

§ 284. Scholasticism during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. 988
285. Mysticism—The Friends of God 993
286. The so-called Revival of Learning by the Humanists 1000
287. The Study of Holy Scriptures—Spread of the Bible among the People 1007

CHAPTER IV. *Spiritual Life—Worship—Penitential Discipline.*

§ 288. Spiritual Life 1014
289. History of the Older Religious Orders 1019
290. Reform of the Older Orders 1021
291. New Orders 1022
292. Independent Associations 1025

§ 293. Worship during this Epoch.......... 1026
294. Christian Art.......... 1038
295. Penitential Discipline.......... 1056
296. Propagation of Christianity and Conversion of the Jews....... 1058
297. Retrospect of the Influence exercised by the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages.......... 1064

I. Chronological Table of Popes and Emperors.......... 1069
II. Chronological Table of Principal Personages and Events......... 1073
III. Chronological Table of Councils.......... 1087
Ecclesiastico-Geographical Map.......... 1097

SECOND PERIOD.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH PREDOMINANT AMONG THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC NATIONS. SHE CONVERTS THEM TO CHRISTIANITY, AND CIVILIZES THEM. HER HISTORY TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

§ 144. *Character of the Roman Catholic Church during the Present Period.*

Relic of *Möhler's* (Hist. Polit. Papers, Vol. X., p. 564–574.) †**J. v. Görres*, l. l. year 1851, Vol. XXVIII., p. 397–407. The *same* Six Lectures on the Fundamental Principle, Method, and Chronological Sequence of Universal History, Breslau, 1830. *De Broglie*, le Moyen âge et l'Église catholique, Paris, 1852. *Montalembert*, in the Introduction to his Monks of the West, Boston, 1872.

A strange feeling of sadness comes over the historian when about to enter upon the Middle Ages. The Ancient World, shrouded in all the glory of the past, and rich in the splendid and incomparable creations of the human mind, is rapidly passing out of view, and Graeco-Roman civilization, poisoned and rotted to the very core, is about to fall to pieces, to be again restored for a season, by the benign and energizing influence of Christianity, to something of its ancient strength and beauty. But Roman society had spent its vital forces and vivifying energies; had become a physical and a moral wreck, and had already gone beyond all possibility of radical and perfect cure, before it passed under the influence of the Church. And, though she might give a lease of existence and impart a measure of her own beauty to a body whose very life-springs were well-nigh dried up, she could not again make it what it once had been, or restore to it the graceful symmetry and agile strength that it had once possessed. But she did what she could; and then bore away to an honorable grave a civilization whose vital powers were exhausted, and whose remedy was beyond her reach.

The Ancient World, weary of the very refinement of its culture, and disheartened at the problem of life, had neither the energy to rouse its vital forces into action, nor the courage to put an end to an existence that had long since become useless. The great Roman Empire, whose name was once so respected and whose power was so irresistible, lay like some shattered form, worn with fatigue and enervated with excess, when the Germanic nations, led on by a higher impulse than barbarous instinct, came forth from their mountains and forests in the North, and precipitated themselves with resistless fury upon the fertile plains of the South. Barbarity hovered like some dense storm-cloud over the fair face of Europe, ready at any moment to break and shroud in a night of chaos those once flourishing seats of learning and civilization. But amid the wreck of the Ancient World, where all around was desolation and ruin, these young and vigorous nations of the North came into contact with a divine and spiritual power by which their rude and untutored strength was overawed and subdued, to which they bowed down and did homage, which they shortly accepted as the inspirer of their lives and the guide of their conduct, and which they finally reverenced as a teacher and a ruler, and cherished as a fond and solicitous mother.

At the opening of the Middle Ages, a *new scene of action* is entered upon, and possesses, in the character of the conflicts in which Christianity will engage, and in the triumphs which it is destined to achieve, features *peculiarly* its own. The home of culture and refinement and the center of great events have been permanently transferred from the East to the West, and from the South to the North.

Again, among the nations of antiquity, the aims, the hopes, the aspirations, and the endeavors of man were centered in the political importance and temporal prosperity of the State, and he possessed no motive of action higher or more potent than these could supply. The security and well-being of the Commonwealth were the sufficient aim and purpose of his life. These were his sole and his all, and constituted the one supreme rule of his conduct.

But in the Middle Ages all this is changed. The motives and purposes of human exertion reached out beyond all objects of sense, and up into a region of thought higher and more pure than any merely natural aspirations could inspire. Hence the character of the progress of mankind will not, in time to come as in time gone by, vary with the varying character of the different nations, as each comes to the front upon the political stage of the world, and, after a season, passes away to make room for its successor, but will have one distinguishing and family feature which will be unmistakably impressed upon all the nations of Europe, because the individual purposes, aims, and aspirations of each will be the common purposes, aims, and aspirations of all, and each separately, and all combined, will employ the same means to work them out. These nations are introduced to history in the infancy of their civilization, and their road of passage to a vigorous manhood is clearly marked across the centuries of the Middle Ages.

In the countries now inhabited by the barbarian conquerors of the Roman Empire, and during these ages, when, according to the fine expression of *Herder*,[1] "*the barque of the Church was freighted with the destiny of mankind*," the Church took up a new position and pursued a line of action to which she had no parallel in her past history.

Furnished with all the external implements of conquest the wealth of ancient culture could supply, and preserving that internal compactness and strength which were a consequence of her well-ordered hierarchy, she went forth to the conflict among the rude and barbarous peoples of Europe, whose souls she regenerated and whose hearts she subdued. Having thus lifted humanity up to a higher estate, she proclaimed herself its guardian, and, as such, carried the weight of her influence into every great question of public and private life; extended the circumference of her jurisdiction till it included questions of a purely civil character; and finally her *Supreme Head*, who during this period reached the zenith of his power, arbitrated between princes and subjects, and nations and peoples.

---

[1] *Herder*, Ideas on the History of Mankind. Stuttg. 1828, Pt. IV., p. 208.

The principle of unity running through the many and diverse tendencies of mediaeval national life, giving the character of oneness to what would else be but a tangled and unintelligible mass of facts, is entirely due to the subduing and predominant influence of the Church and the energizing life of her *religion*, whose teachings schooled the minds of all to common purposes of action, inspired them with common motives, and furnished a common center, toward which every endeavor gravitated, and in which might be found its sufficient explanation. Hence the very *character and genius of the Middle Ages* are but the natural outgrowth of religion and of the social organization that came into existence under its influence.

Some writers prefer to find in the condition of the Church, at this time, only a fit subject for hostile criticism, and the abundant source of all the evils that came upon the Middle Ages; while others, more temperate and unquestionably more fair, candidly admit that, in this age when civilization was still in its infancy, she alone possessed and preserved the principle of spiritual and moral fecundity which was to work out the full development of mankind thoughout all coming time.[1] That the Church exercised a beneficent action and a salutary influence upon the Middle Ages, has been asserted and maintained by men of every shade of opinion, whose ability is beyond all reasonable question, and whose principles are such as to acquit them of any suspicion of undue partiality.

Herder, the eloquent panegyrist of humanity, says, in his *Ideas on the History of Mankind*:[2] "It is doubtlessly true to say that the Roman hierarchy was a necessary power, without which there would have been no check upon the untutored nations of the Middle Ages. Without it, Europe would have fallen under the power of a despot, would have become the theater of interminable conflicts, and have been converted into a Mongolian desert."

---

[1] † *Wührer*, The Beneficent Influence of the Church during the Middle Ages for the Decrease of Ignorance, Barbarity, and Lawlessness. (*Pletz*, New Theol. Journal, Vienna, 1831, Vol. I., p. 219 sq.) †*Kober*, Influence of the Church and her Legislation on Morality, Humanity, and Civilization during the M. A. (Tübing. Theol. Quart. 1858, pp. 443–449.) Compare *Guizot*, l'église et la société chrétienne, Paris, 1861, p. 65..

[2] Ideas on the Hist. of Mankind, Pt. IV., p. 303. Cf. p. 194 sq.

And the great historian of Switzerland discourses as follows upon the same subject: "All the enlightenment of the present day, whereof the daring spirit of Europe will not permit us to forecast the ultimate consequences, either to ourselves or to the other nations of the world, came originally from that hierarchy which, when the Roman Empire fell to pieces, sustained and directed the human race. It imparted, so to speak, to the mind of Northern Europe, which as yet possessed neither elevation nor grasp of thought, a stirring, an energizing, and a life-giving impulse, under the impact of which it was carried forward, retarded indeed by many adverse and accelerated by some favorable circumstances, till it finally achieved the triumphs that are now before the world.[1]"

To put forward the correct view, and to establish it by well-ascertained and irrefragable facts, is the simple duty of the conscientious historian. His work is greatly facilitated by the historical researches of modern times. These, whether pursued by Catholic or Protestant scholars, are more reliable and impartial than those of former years, and have shed so much light upon the particular question in point, and rendered so large a measure of justice to the Middle Ages, as a whole, that the most reluctant and stubborn minds will be forced to admit that freedom, elevation, enlightenment, and moral grandeur—not servitude, depravity, ignorance, and immorality—were the distinguishing characteristics of these Ages of Faith. In proof of this, the following authorities may be quoted:

1. *Gallé*, in his *Voices of the Middle Ages*,[2] says: "One may, in this day, indulge the hope that these voices from a distant past will not return void or die away without calling forth a responsive and generous sympathy. The age of rigid, ortho-

---

[1] *John v. Müller*, Hist. of Switzerland, Book III., c. 1, "*Hierarchy*."

[2] Halle, 1841, Preface, p. vi.

dox Lutheranism, which spurned every effort of the human mind having the most remote connection with the Middle Ages, has long since passed away. We are now far removed from those days, when men professed to see in the Reformation the dawn of that glorious light which we now enjoy; and in the Middle Ages, but a long and hopeless night, overcast with a deep darkness, the fit accompaniment of ignorance and barbarity."

2. *Jacob Grimm*, in his *Antiquities of German Law*,[1] says: "The wise men of our generation judge of the Middle Ages with about as much fairness as they do of our ancestors of ancient Germany. The ancient poetry of the Germans, which brings before the mind, in a hundred living and glowing pictures, the whole-souled and gladsome life of bygone days, has been reproduced; but to what purpose? It should seem that the senseless gabble about the right of the strong and the oppression of feudal lords would never cease. People talk as though we were strangers to misery and wrong in these latter days; as though there was not one gleam of hope and comfort to soften and soothe the sufferings of the past. Well and good; but from a legal point of view, I will venture to assert that the bondage and servitude of past ages was less harsh and more tolerable than is the condition of our own oppressed peasants, and of the overtaxed journeymen of our factories. The difficulties to be encountered by the poor, and those who go out to serve, in procuring a license to marry, border on servitude," etc.

3. *Daniel*, in his *Theological Controversies*,[2] says: "We have all got into the habit of asserting, over and over again, like a set of parrots with whom it has become a sort of law to hold such language, that the Middle Ages were ages of ignorance and corruption; and we would listen to one demonstrating that two and two make five with far more temper than we should exhibit in entertaining the thought that the darkness which was then upon the earth was not so thick that one might cut it with a knife."

---

[1] 2d ed. Göttingen, 1854, Pref. p. xxi. sq.

[2] Halle, 1843, p. 73.

All this is indeed bad enough; but, if possible, a worse service is done the Middle Ages by those authors who set out with the distinct purpose of writing up everything connected with them; who set them up as models of civil and ecclesiastical polity, and who propose, for permanent imitation to all future time, a condition of things which was itself the effect and outcome of a state of transition.[1]

"The Middle Ages," says *Böhmer*, "from having been long unfairly represented, have now come to receive an undue measure of praise. If, on the one hand, the powers of the soul developed with wonderful wealth and beauty, and produced immortal works of great depth and learning, it should not be forgotten, on the other, that traces of barbarism are everywhere visible."

"The Middle Ages," adds *Kraus*,[2] "were a season of young and luxuriant growth, and produced abnormal and extravagant examples of both goodness and wickedness. They were distinguished by loftiness, originality, and strength of character, in a degree to which no preceding or succeeding age can furnish a parallel; because only an age of simple, living, and vigorous faith is capable of producing great and noble characters. Nor can it be denied that the higher aspirations of intellectual life during the Middle Ages were directed toward speculation and scientific method. But their strength lay not in this direction. Political theories, poetical creations, and works of fiction, in which the warm and brilliant imagination of the writer not unfrequently borders on the extravagant, are the characteristic intellectual productions of these youthful nations. If there be one thing more apparent than another, in all their works of art, in their majestic Gothic cathedrals, and in their theories and speculations, it is a reaching out after something higher and holier than earth—an attempt to rise up to the very throne of Heaven, to come nearer and nearer to the Most High God. It is not wonderful, then, that with aspirations so lofty, they should lose sight of the mere objects of sense that surrounded them on every side. Like some inexperienced child, they gazed in admiration and wonder upon the phenomena of nature, and regarded it as they might a riddle of which the solution had been lost. They possessed but a vague knowledge of the history of mankind, and antiquity was to them visible only in undefined outline, and lay at so great a distance behind them that they could catch but imperfect glimpses of it through the hazy medium of legendary lore. But few had any proper appreciation of the office and importance of history. Under such circumstances did these nations enter upon the arena of the civilized world to undertake the solution of the problems of life. They were ignorant of the past, and had no concern in its affairs; but they were keenly alive to the needs of their own times, and met them, as they successively came up, with astonishing versatility of resource.

---

[1] *Kraus*, Text-Book of the Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages. Treves, 1873, Vol. II., p. 205. (Tr.)

[2] Ibid. p. 206.

"Borrowing but little from the ancient civilization of the nations they had conquered, they created a civilization peculiar to themselves, of which the prominent features were feudalism and chivalry, vassalage and the hierarchical organization of the States General. Civil equality was indeed entirely unknown to the Middle Ages; but, for all this, taking all the institutions of that period, one with another, and it can not be denied that they were more conducive to freedom and independence than any which characterized Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, and than many which exist in a number of European states in our own day. The full development of the hierarchy, which had now grown wealthy and powerful; the astonishing growth of monasticism; the influence of religion, by which the authority of the Church was reverenced and obeyed by men in every walk of life; and finally, the exaltation of the Papacy and the restoration of the Western Empire through its exertions, complete the picture of the Middle Ages—a period which, when everything is taken into account, is great and memorable in the annals of mankind, which we have no wish to see restored, but of which we have no reason to be ashamed."

No man was better qualified than Count *Montalembert* to appreciate justly and depict faithfully the characteristic traits of the Middle Ages; and no man has done so with greater power and brilliancy. The reader will pardon us, therefore, for giving his words at some length:[1]

> The Middle Ages stand unfortunately between two camps at the deepest enmity with each other, which only agree in misconstruing it. The one hate it, because they believe it an enemy to all liberty; the others praise it, because they seek arguments and examples there to justify the universal servitude and prostration which they extol. Both are agreed to travesty and insult it—the one by their invectives, the others by their eulogiums.
>
> I affirm that both deceive themselves, and that they are equally and profoundly ignorant of the Middle Ages, which were an epoch of faith, but also a period of strife, of discussion, of dignity, and, above all, of freedom.
>
> The error common to both admirers and detractors of the Middle Ages consists in seeing there the reign and triumph of theocracy. It was, they tell us, a time distinguished forever by human impotence, and by the glorious dictatorship of the Church.
>
> I deny the dictatorship, and I still more strongly deny the human impotence.
>
> Humanity was never more fertile, more manful, more potent; and as for the Church, she has never seen her authority more contested in practice, even by those who recognized it most dutifully in theory. . . .
>
> Religion, it is true, governed all; but she stifled nothing. She was not banished into a corner of society, immured within the inclosure of her own temples, or of individual conscience. On the contrary, she was invited to animate, enlighten, and penetrate everything with the spirit of life; and after she had set the foundation of the edifice upon a base which could not be shaken, her maternal hand returned to crown its summit with light and beauty. None were placed too high to obey her, and none fell so low as to be out of reach of her consolations and protection.
>
> From the king to the hermit, all yielded at some time to the sway of her pure and generous inspirations. The memory of Redemption, of that debt contracted toward God by the race which was redeemed on Calvary, mingled with everything, and was to be found in all institutions, in all monuments, and, at certain moments, in all hearts. The victory of charity over selfishness, of humility over pride, of spirit over flesh, of all that is elevated in our nature over all the ignoble and impure elements included in it, was as frequent as human weakness permitted. That victory is never complete here below; but we can affirm without fear, that it never was approached so closely. Since the first great defiance thrown down by the establishment of Christianity to the triumph of evil in the world, never perhaps has the empire of the devil been so much shaken and contested.
>
> Must we, then, conclude that the Middle Ages are the ideal period of Christian society? Ought we to see there the normal condition of the world? God forbid! In the first place, there never has been, and never will be, a normal state or irreproachable epoch in this earth. And, besides, if that ideal could be realized here below, it is not in the Middle Ages that it has been attained. These ages have been called the ages of faith; and they have been justly so called, for faith was more sovereign then than in any other epoch of history. But

---

[1] Monks of the West, American ed., Vol. I., Introd. p. 120–131.

there we must stop. This is much, but it is enough for the truth. We can not venture to maintain that virtue and happiness have been throughout these ages on a level with faith. A thousand incontrovertible witnesses would rise up to protest against such a rash assertion, to recall the general insecurity, the too frequent triumphs of violence, iniquity, cruelty, deceit, sometimes even of refined depravity; to demonstrate that the human and even diabolical element reasserted, only too strongly, their ascendency in the world. By the side of the opened heavens, hell always appeared; and beside those prodigies of sanctity which are so rare elsewhere, were to be found ruffians scarcely inferior to those Roman emperors whom Bossuet calls "monsters of the human race."

The Church, which is always influenced up to a certain point by contemporary civilization, endured many abuses and scandals, the very idea of which would to-day horrify both her children and her enemies. They proceeded sometimes from that corruption which is inseparable from the exercise of great power and the possession of great wealth; sometimes, and most frequently, from the invasions of the lay spirit and temporal power. Yes, cupidity, violence, and debauchery revolted often, and with success, against the yoke of the Gospel, even among its own ministers; they infected even the organs of the law promulgated to repress them. We can, and ought to, confess it without fear, because all these excesses were redeemed by marvels of self-denial, penitence, and charity; because beside every fall is found an expiation; for every misery, an asylum; to every wickedness, some resistance. Sometimes in cells of monasteries, sometimes in caves of the rocks; here, under the tiara or the miter; there, under the helmet and coat of arms, thousands of souls fought with glory and perseverance the battles of the Lord, fortifying the feeble by their example, reviving the enthusiasm even of those who neither wished nor knew how to imitate them, and displaying, over the vices and disorders of the crowd, the splendid light of their prodigious austerity, their profuse charity, their unwearied love of God. But all this dazzling light of virtue and sanctity ought not to blind us to what lay beneath. There were more saints, more monks, and, above all, more believers, than in our days; but I do not hesitate to say that there were fewer priests, I mean good priests. Yes, the secular clergy of the Middle Ages were less pure, less exemplary than ours; the episcopate less respectable, and the spiritual authority of the Holy See much less sovereign than now. This assertion will, perhaps, astonish some in their ignorant admiration; but it is not the less easy to prove it. The pontifical power has, at the present time, subjects less numerous, but infinitely more docile. What it has lost in extent, it has more than gained in intensity. . . .

Never, then, was anything more false and puerile than the strange pretense, maintained by certain tardy supporters of the Catholic renaissance, of presenting the Middle Ages to us as a period in which the Church was always victorious and protected; as a promised land flowing with milk and honey, governed by kings and nobles piously kneeling before the priests, and by a devout, silent, and docile crowd, tranquilly stretched out under the crook of their pastors, to sleep in the shade, under the double authority of the inviolably respected throne and altar. Far from that, there never were greater passions, more disorders, wars, and revolts; but, at the same time, there were never greater virtues, more generous efforts for the service of goodness. All was war, dangers, and tempests in the Church, as in the State; but all was likewise strong, robust, and vivacious: everything bore the impression of life and strife. On the one side, faith—a faith sincere, naive, simple, and vigorous, without hypocrisy as without insolence, neither servile nor narrow-minded, exhibiting every day the imposing spectacle of strength in humility; on the other, institutions militant and manful, which, amid a thousand defects, had the admirable virtue of creating men, not valets or pious eunuchs, and which one and all ordained these men to action, to sacrifice, and continual exertions. Strong natures everywhere vigorously nourished, and in no direction stifled, quenched, or disdained, found their place there with ease and simplicity. Feeble natures, with the fiber relaxed, found there the most fitting regimen to give them vigor and tone. Worthy people, relying upon a master who undertook to defend all by silencing or enchaining their adversaries, were not to be seen there. We can not look upon these Christians as on good little lambs, bleating devoutly among wolves, or taking courage between the knees of the shepherd. They appear, on the contrary, like athletes, like soldiers engaged every day in fighting for the most sacred possessions; in a word, like men armed with the most robust personality and individual force, unfettered as undecaying.

As for those among its detractors who accuse the Catholic past of the Western races of being incompatible with freedom, we can oppose to them the unanimous testimony, not only of all historical monuments, but of all those democratic writers of our own day, who have profoundly studied this past. Above all, of M. Augustin Thierry, who has shown so well how many barriers and guaranties had to be overthrown by royalty before it would establish its universal sway. This ancient world was bristling with liberty. The spirit of resistance, the sentiment of individual right, penetrated it entirely; and it is this which always and everywhere constitutes the essence of freedom. That freedom has established everywhere a system of counterpoise and restraint, which rendered all prolonged despotism absolutely impossible. But its special guaranties were two principles which modern society has renounced—the principles of hérédité and association. Besides, they appear to us under the form of privileges, which is enough to prevent many from understanding or admiring them.

It was the energetic and manly character of their institutions and men which secured the reign of liberty in the Middle Ages. We have already pointed this out, but we can not revert to it too often. Everything there breathes freedom, health, and life—all is full of vigor, force, and youth. 'T is like the first burst of nature, whose spontaneous vigor had not yet been robbed of any portion of its grace and charm. We see limpid and healthful currents everywhere springing forth and extending themselves. They encounter a thousand obstacles and embarrassments upon their way; but almost always they surmount and overthrow these, to carry afar the fertilizing virtue of their waters.

Weakness and baseness! these are precisely the things which were most completely unknown to the Middle Ages. They had their vices and crimes, numerous and atrocious; but in them proud and strong hearts never failed. In public life as in private, in the world as in the cloister, strong and magnanimous souls everywhere break forth—illustrious character and great individuals abounded. And therein lies the true, the undeniable superiority of the Middle Ages. It was an epoch fertile in men—

"Magna parens virûm."

FIRST EPOCH.

FROM THE MIGRATION OF THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC NATIONS TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII., A. D. 1073.

FOUNDATION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

PART FIRST.

FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE, A. D. 814.

> "I became all things to all men that I might save all." I. Cor. ix. 22.

§ 145. *Sources and Works.*

Meihomii rer. German. scriptores, Helmst. 1688 sq. 3 T. fol. *Leibnitii* scriptores rerum Brunsvic. illustrationi inservientes, Hanov. 1707 sq. 3 T. fol. *Freheri* rerum Germ. scriptor. ed. *Struve* Argentor. 1717 sq. 3 T. fol. *Ussermanni* Monumenta res Alemannicas illustr., typis St. Blasian. 2 T. 4to. **Pertz*, Monumenta Germ. historica, Hanov. 1826–1875, 21 T. fol. (T. I. II. V. VI–XIV. and XVI–XXIII. contain scriptores; T. III. IV. and XV. leges.) *Harzhemii* S. J. Concilia Germ. (until 1747) Colon. 1759 sq. 11 T. fol. **Jaffé*, bibliotheca rerum Germanicar. Berol. 1864 sq. 4 T. Conf. *Dahlmann*, Authentic Documents of German History, 2d ed. Götting. 1839. * *Wattenbach*, Sources of the History of Germany in the Middle Ages, 2d ed. Berlin, 1866. The Historians of German Antiquity in a German dress, by Pertz, Grimm, and others, Berlin, 1847 sq. *Du Chesne*, hist. Francor. scriptor. Par. 1636 sq. 5 T. fol. **Bouquet-Dom Brial*, rer. Gallicar. & Franc. scriptor. Par. 1738–1833, 19 T. fol. *Muratori*, rer. Ital. scriptor. Mediol. 1723 sq. 27 T. fol. Commenced, Monumenta Britan. Conf. *Rösler*, de annalium medii aevi condit. and de arte critica in ann. Tübg. 1788 sq. 4to.

Gregor. Turonens, h. e. Francorum epitomized, and continued by *Fredegar* until 641, ed. *Ruinart*, Paris, 1699 fol. (*Bouquet*, T. II. p. 75), in German, Würzbg. 1848 sq. *Beda Venerab.* h. e gentis Anglorum. *Jornandes*, de rebus Geticis, until 540, ed. *Fabricius*, Hambg. 1706, fol., ed. *Closs*, Stuttg. 1861. (*Muratori*, T. I. p. 187.) *Isidor. Hispal.* hist. Gothor., Vandalor., Suevor., until 625, ed. *Rösler*, Tüb. 1803, 4to. *Isidor. Pacens.* (about 754) chron. (*du Chesne*, T. I.) *Paulus Warnefridus*, diaconus, de gestis Longobard. libb. VI., fr. 568–744. (*Muratori*, T. I., P. I. p. 395 sq.) *Annales* rer. Francicar: *Laurissenses* 741–829, revised and continued from 788 in Annales *Einhardi* 741–829. Annales *Fuldenses*, 714–901. *Bertiniani*, 741–882. (*Pertz*, T. I. p. 124 sq.)

Also, the Church Histories of particular countries: Italia sacra, Gallia christiana, Germania sacra, España sagrada, etc. †*Papencordt*, Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, ed. by *Höfler*, Paderb. 1857. *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, Stuttg. 1859 sq. 7 vols. until 1500; of Vol. I. 2d ed. 1870. *v. *Reumont*, Hist. of the City of Rome, Berl. 1867, 3 vols.

Baronii annal. *Natal. Alex.* h. e. saec. VI. sq. *Fleury* (see our Vol. I., p. 46). *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pts. 16–25. *Binterim*, Philosophical Hist. of the German National and Provincial Councils, from the Fourth Century to the Council of Trent. See, for this Period, Vols. I. and II.

Profane Historians: †*Damberger*, Synchronistic Hist. of Church and State in the Middle Ages, Ratisbon, 1850 sq., in 15 vols., until 1378. †*Cantù*, Universal History of the World, Vol. V. †**Phillips*, German History, with particular attention to Religion, Civil Laws, and Political Constitution, 2 vols. Berlin, 1832–1836. †*Fehr*, Hand-book of Christian Universal History, Vol. I., Pt. I. p. 312 sq., and Pt. II. †*Weiss*, Text-book of the History of the World, Vol. II. **Leo*, Lectures on German History, Halle, 1854 sq. Vol. I. †*Schlegel*, Philosophy of Hist. Vol. II. *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Hist. of the World, Vols. 4–5. See especially *Heeren* and *Ukert*, Hist. of the European States, Hambg. 1820 sq. *Wachsmuth*, Hist. of European Morals, Lps. 1831–1839, 5 vols. Conf. **Potthast*, bibliotheca historica medii aevi: Guide through the historical works of European Middle Ages, Berlin, 1862. The Supplement thereto, same place, 1868, gives a most elaborate history of the literature of that period.

§ 146. *Religion of the Germans.* (*Conf.* § 12.)

I. *Herodoti* histor. lib. IV. c. 93 and 94; lib. V. c. 3. *Tacit.* de situ, morib. et popul. Germaniae, and annal. XIII. 57; historiar. IV. 64. *Jornandes*, de reb. Geticis. Abrenuntiatio diaboli and indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum cum commentar. (*Ekart*, comment. de rebus Francor. orient. Wirceb. 1729, T. I. p. 405 sqq. epp. Bonifacii ed. *Würdtwein*, p. 126 sq.; ed. *Giles*.)

II. *Döllinger*, The Jew and the Gentile, p. 49 sq. *Krafft*, Ch. H. of the Germanic Nations, Brl. 1854, Vol. I. p. 128 sq. †*Phillips*, German History, Vol. I. *Jacob Grimm*, German Mythology, Götting. (1835) 3d ed. 1854. *Simrock*, Manual of German Mythology, including also Northern, 2d ed. Stuttg. 1859. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. I. p. 246 sq.

We have already remarked[1] in the first period of this history, that, when the Barbarians made incursions into the Roman Empire, and particularly while the Arian controversies were going forward, many tribes of Germanic origin were converted to Christianity. But as the propagation and growth of Christianity among them presented features peculiar to the people, and wholly different from those which accompanied the conversion of the Greeks and Romans, and as they took no part in the doctrinal controversies which agitated the rest of the Christian world, it was thought that their history might be rendered more clear and intelligible by treating it separately.

---

[1] See Vol. I. § 107.

The earliest information we possess of the Germans[1] is derived from the pages of Tacitus, who treats of them from the time they first came into contact with the Romans.

There is among them a time-honored tradition, according to which they revere, as the father of their race, *Thuisto* (*Duisco*, *Deutscher*), who is represented as having sprung from the earth, and perpetuated his offspring through his son, *Mannus.* That they were of Asiatic origin, there can be no doubt. Their very name, *Reche*, signifying a foreigner or an exile, points unmistakably to their migratory character. The date of this migration can not be positively fixed, but it is more than likely that it was coeval with the great confederation of the Assyrian tribes, and that the forward movement of the Scythians was the immediate occasion of it.

Tacitus represents the Germans to us as a people living in the state of nature, and in the traditions and poetry of the past, distinguished by their love of war and their intrepidity in presence of danger; by their strong sense of justice and the fidelity of their attachments; and by their disregard of death and their high appreciation of woman,[2] whom they regarded as in every respect the equal of man.

Their social relations were, as a rule, confined within the limits of those tribes bearing the same names. When arrayed in order of battle, each family had its appointed place; and so great was their love of freedom and independence, that, unless compelled by the most imperative necessity, they would not submit to a superior or obey a chief; and, should they be so unfortunate as to receive punishment at the hands of the latter, they would consider such disgrace as the deepest depth of infamy to which it was possible to fall. He alone deserved the name of freeman[3] who had the courage and ability to defend his life by personal prowess; and to be disarmed in the conflict and deprived of liberty, was an irreparable misfortune.

---

[1] The name is derived from *Gehr*, or *Wehr-Mannen, Wehr-männer* = *War-men.*

[2] Divinum aliquid et providum feminis inesse putant. Tacit. c. 8, Germ.

[3] Wĕr, waro, baro, Spanish varon.

There existed, however, between the bondman and the free, different degrees of dependence, which varied according to circumstances. The German was not even separated in death from the war-horse and the arms with which he had gained his conquests and defended his personal liberty.

The *Religion* of the ancient Germans, like that of all primitive nations, though less poetic and not so elaborately artistic as the paganism of the Greeks and Romans, consisted in a simple *worship of nature*, bearing in many respects a close resemblance to that of the *Persians*—a people with whom the Germans were very nearly allied in language and physical constitution.[1] Their conception of the Deity was beautiful and exalted. "They conceive," says Tacitus, "that to confine gods within walls, or to represent them in *human* similitude, is unworthy the grandeur of celestial beings. They consecrate woods and groves to them, and designate by titles of divinity that secret Power which they apprehend only by the instinct of reverence."[2]

The simplicity of their worship was not accompanied by the sacrificial pomp common to the Gauls.[3] Still, it would be incorrect to apply to all the Germans, indiscriminately, the accounts given by Caesar and Tacitus. The latter speaks of one of their *temples* of *Tanfana*, in the land of the Marsi,[4] and the reports of Christian missionaries, who visited these nations at a later day, make mention of quite a number. Both Caesar and Tacitus inform us that the Germans worshiped a *divine Trinity*, known, according to the former of these writers, as the *Sun*, *Vulcan*, and the *Moon;* and, according to the latter, as *Mercury*, *Hercules*, and *Mars*.

---

[1] See Vol. I. § 25.

[2] *Tacit.* Germ., c. 9. Cf. *Agath.*, Hist. I. 7.

[3] Germani multum ab hac (Gallor.) consuetudine differunt; nam neque Druidas habent qui rebus divinis praesint, neque sacrificiis student. *Caesar*, de bello Gallico, VI. 21.

[4] *Tacit.* Ann. I. 51. Cf. *Grimm*, loco cit., p. 55. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II., p. 576.

Christian missionaries also inform us that the Germans paid special homage to three principal deities, and *St. Columbanus* discovered three idols on the shores of the Lake of Constance. The number three again recurs in their formula of abjuration of the eighth century.

Woutan (Wodan, hence Wodan's day, or Wednesday) was the chief divinity among the Germans. From his throne, high up in the heavens, he gazes through a window out upon the earth, and considers the various occupations of men; or he leads the throng in the wild career of a savage hunt through the air, ranges the hosts in order of battle, and looks after the other avocations of man.

Beside him is *Hulda*, the fearless huntress, who by turns follows the peaceful avocation of a shepherdess, attends Woutan on his aerial voyages through the clouds, admonishes women of their domestic duties, or threatens those who yield to the solicitations of slothful slumbers.

Next to Hulda come the *sons* of Woutan. These are *Donar* (Thor, Thunaer, whence Donnerstag, or Thursday), who hurls the thunderbolt down upon the earth and flashes the fury of the lightning from out the depths of the clouds; and the one-handed *Ziu* (Tyr, Jr, Erich), the god of war (whence *Erich's-Zinstag*, *Dienstag*, *Tuesday;* French, Mardi; Ital., Martedì).

Besides these gods of terror, were ranged a race of *more beneficent divinities*, whose office was to look after the fertility of the fields. First came *Ingo*, next *Nerthus* (Mother-earth), accompanied by her offspring, *Frouwo* (Freya), the amiable companion of Woutan (whence Freitag, Friday; French, Vendredi; Ital., Venerdì); and the goddess *Ostare* (*Eostra*), through whose genial influence the glory of spring rises from the death of winter.

If the Germans were proud and arrogant, and refused to submit to any human authority, they were equally humble and submissive in matters of religion, and ready to yield full obedience to the ordinances of the Deity, as revealed through the oracles of their priests.[1]

---

[1] *Tacit.* Germ., c. 7. Neque animadvertere neque vincire, ne verberare quidem nisi *sacerdotibus* permissum.

They selected as places of sacrifice the tops of mountains, the margin of a clear spring, the surface of a rock, but chiefly the gloomy and mysterious shades of a forest of oaks. They also offered *human sacrifices* by the Lake of *Hertha*, on the island of Rügen. A young man and maiden were cast together into this lake, and perished in its waters.

Doubtful questions of right were submitted to the decision of the gods, whose judgment was made known by issue of duels, Runic wands, and other species of *ordeal*. To test whether a child were legitimate or no, it was placed upon a shield and immersed in the water; if it reappeared on the surface, the judgment was deemed favorable.

When, finally, one of their number took leave of the joys and sorrows of this life, the Germans paid the last tribute of respect to his remains with simple and impressive ceremonies, unaccompanied by either extravagant tumult or pompous parade. The Southern Germans burned, the Northern Germans buried, their dead; and a modest hillock, covered with green sward, was the only monument that marked their last resting-place.[1]

§ 147. *Religious Belief of the Germans in Scandinavia.*

I. The Edda (the story-telling great grandmother), the *more ancient, poetical* one, by Saemund Sigfusson (†1133), Edda rhythmica seu antiquior Saemundina dicta ed. *Thorlacius, Finn Magnusen*, etc., Hamb. 1787–1828, 3 T. 4to. Editio rec. *Raskii* cur. *Afzelius*. Holm. 1818. Translation of many songs, by *Hagen*, Breslau, 1814. *Grimm*, Berlin, 1815. *Legis*, Lps. 1829 sq., 3 vols. The *prosaic Edda*, commenced by the celebrated statesman and historian of Iceland, *Snorre Sturleson* (†1241), finished in the fourteenth century. *Snorna-Edda* ásamt Skáldu af Rask, Stockholm, 1818; transl. by *Fr. Rühs*, Berlin, 1812. The earlier and the later Edda, together with the mythological tales of the Skalda, translated and illustrated by *Simrock*, Stuttgardt, 1855. Extracts and comments by *Krafft*, Vol. I., p. 118–212. The poem, *Muspilli*, ed. by *Schmeller* (*Buchner's* Contributions, Munich, 1832, Vol. I., nro. 2), *Saxo Grammaticus* and *Adam Bremensis*.

II. *Stuhr*, Faith, Science, Philosophy, and Poetry of the Ancient Scandinavians, Copenhagen, 1825. *Legis*, Alkuna Mythology of the North, Lps. 1831. *Hochmeister*, Mythology of the North, Hanover, 1832. *Petersen* and *Thomsen*, Guide to the Knowledge of Northern Antiquities, translated by *Paulsen*, Copenhagen, 1837. *Münter*, Ch. II. of Denmark and Norway, Lps. 1823, p. 1–104.

---

[1] Funerum nulla ambitio, . . . monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem, ut gravem defunctis, adspernantur. *Tacit.* Germ., c. 27. These words are remarkable when compared with what Tacitus says of their architecture.

The mythology of these Northern Germans contains all the essential elements of religious belief common to every German nation, but among them religion wears a more gloomy aspect, and *its similarity to the worship of nature among the ancient Persians is still more marked and striking. Odin*, the supreme god, creates the world from the body of the giant *Ymer*, whom he has put to death; and the latter circumstance becomes the prolific source of interminable wars between the creating gods and the race of giants. *Thor* is the god of thunder and of war; *Freyr* is the generating power, and *Freya* the prolific mother, of nature. These three presided over the destinies of men; Odin gives victory, glory, and the gift of song, and Freya brings the joys of requited and the bitterness of disappointed love. The false and the cowardly expiate their deeds of baseness in *Niflheim*, and those who come to an inglorious end wander forlorn in the shades of the kingdom of *Hela;* but such as are chosen from among their fellows by favor of the *Valkyres*, and such as fall gloriously on the field of battle, ascend to *Walhalla*, there to continue, until the end of the world, their life of heroism in the company of the gods.

Their sacrificial worship was but a feast of pleasure, during which the banqueters drank their beverages from horns. In seasons of exceptional trouble and threatening danger, they offered *human sacrifices.*

Notwithstanding that gods and men are on easy and familiar terms, a note of *deep* and *plaintive grief* runs through the Edda from first to last. Both men and gods feel the pangs of sorrow and taste the bitterness of death. Even *Baldar*, the son of Odin, has a presentiment, and the words of an oracle confirm its truth, that the ancient powers of darkness will be one day let loose, come up out of their abyss, and destroy mankind. Although restrained for a season by the prowess of the *Ases*, the most distinguished of the heroes of ancient time, they will in the end break their fetters, and, after a brief and terrible conflict, drag down into the deep abyss both the Ases and the heroes of Walhalla. While the conflict is still in progress, the world, according to the same oracle, shall go to pieces, and be consumed by fire (*Muspilli*—End of the world).

A new *earth arises* out of this ruin, on which a male and female, still in the state of innocence, are placed. Here also dwell some of the sons of the fallen gods, together with Baldar, who has made his escape from the lower regions.

But, in the midst of grotesque fancies like these, the belief in an unkown and higher Power comes prominently forward, to whose general purpose the issue of all these trifling conflicts is subservient; who is the energizing principle of the forces of nature, and who restored the world to its *present* definite and permanent form (Alfadur).

From this outline of the religious belief of the ancient Germans, we are enabled, besides giving an insight into their character, to understand in how far their doctrines contributed to *open their minds to* the truths of *Christianity*, and to account for—

1. The purity and delicacy of faith which they exhibited after having once embraced the Gospel. 2. The deep feeling of reverence with which they received the first Christian missionaries, who, in the early days of the mission, were almost, without exception, foreigners. 3. The many and various forms of trial by ordeal, such as those by fire and water, and the appeal to the judgment of God. 4. And, finally, the genius which inspired their architecture and religious paintings. For what are the great and lofty domes of their churches; the countless delicate columns, spreading, as they rise, into branching boughs, and forming sweeping vaults overhead; the finely tapered spires, piercing the very clouds, adorned with sculptured flowers and foliage cut in stone, and with fantastic statuettes of matchless beauty, but symbols, borrowed from the wild oak forests of ancient Germany, to which a spiritual and a Christian signification has been given, and which have been forever consecrated to the worship of the true God?

And is not the mysterious and awe-inspiring light of those temples, softened and toned till it wears the guise of another world; and the cunningly wrought and elaborate branch-work, with stem and leaf and flower, through which the bright sunbeams enter with magic effect and indescribable charm, but a feeble attempt to transfer to the purposes of religion something of the majesty and beauty of those grand primeval religious sanctuaries of the Germans.[1]

---

[1] See art. Romans and Germans, in the *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. XII., p. 473 sq.

CHAPTER I.

PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

Gratianus, Hist. of the Propagation of Christianity in the States of Europe, arisen from the ruins of the Roman Empire, Tübg. 1778, 2 vols. †*Hiemer*, Introduction of Christianity in German countries, Schaffh. 1857 sq. *Döllinger*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 138–244. Engl. Transl. of Germanic Nations. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. I. *Krafft*, Ch. H., Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 327 sq. †**Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germany, Bamberg, 1867 sq., 2 vols. *Rückert*, Hist. of the Civilization of the German People during the period of their transition from Paganism to Christianity, 2 vols., Lps. 1853. **Fehr*, Introd. to the Hist. of Church and State in the Middle Ages, Stuttg. 1859. The *same*, State and Church in the Frankish Empire, Vienna, 1869. *E. v. Wietersheim*, Hist. of the Migration of Nations, 4 vols., Lps. 1869. **Gfrörer*, Contrib. toward a Hist. of German Popular Rights in the Middle Ages, 2 vols., Schaffh. 1865–66. *Pallmann*, Hist. of the Migr. of Nations, 2 vols., Weimar, 1862–1864. Tr.—For a lucid survey of the Migr. of Nations, see the Hist. Atlas by *Spruner* and by * *Wedell*, which is still better than the former.

§ 148. *Among the Goths.*

Conf. the art. "*Goths*" in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop. and the works of *Waitz* on the Life and Doctrine of Ulfila, Hanover, 1840, and *Bessel*, The Life of Ulfila and the Conversion of the Goths, Götting. 1860.

The coming of our Divine Lord, which effected so great a revolution in the spiritual world, exercised an influence no less potent and radical in the political. During the course of the fourth and fifth centuries, the nations of the North and East commenced to move forward toward the South and West, without, as we should judge, either guidance or purpose, but really *in obedience to a call from God*,[1] and for the accomplishment of a holy destiny. They were carried forward toward the land in which the Light of the world had dawned, and where its effulgence was steadily growing in splendor, till their vast multitudes fairly thronged those countries in which, according to divine appointment, the Church of Christ had already been established. That so momentous a significance should attach to *the migration of nations* was early asserted by the unknown author of a work directed against Pelagius, and entitled *De Vocatione Gentium.*[1] Neither was the Church unprepared or unwilling to give a warm welcome to these rude warriors. On the contrary, she was patiently waiting the time when it should graciously please God to call both kings and people within the subduing influence of His holy faith.

---

[1] John vi. 44.

In the second century of the Christian era, the Goths, issuing from the wilds of Scandinavia, sought a home on the shores of the Black Sea. Of these, the Ostrogoths settled between the Don and the Dniester, and the Visigoths between the Dniester and the Theiss. From the third century onward, they waged bloody and relentless wars against the Roman emperors, and not unfrequently made incursions into the provinces, and particularly into those of Greece and Asia Minor, carrying desolation wherever they went.

Having been expelled from Thrace by the victorious Constantine, numbers of them entered the imperial army, and it is chiefly to the valor of their arms that the victory gained over Licinius at Byzantium, A. D. 323, which *decided the fate of the world*, should be ascribed.

It was from the soldiers of the Roman legions, taken prisoners during these conflicts, that the Goths gained their first knowledge of the Christian religion.[2] They were represented at the *Council of Nice*, A. D. 325, by Bishop *Theophilus*,[3] and about the year 347, *Cyril* of Jerusalem,[4] speaking of them, said: "Bishops and priests, and even monks and nuns, may be found among the Goths."

They preserved the *Catholic faith* pure and intact until the reign of Valens, from whom the Visigoths, divided into two bodies under the respective leaders *Fridiger* and *Athanaric*, and driven forward by the advance of the Huns (A. D. 326), sought an asylum. The emperor granted them permission to take up their abode on the southern bank of the Danube, but only on condition that they should embrace Christianity, which, under the circumstances, meant simply the *Arian heresy.*

---

[1] *Rösler*, Dissert. de magna gentium migratione ejusque primo impulsu. Tüb. 1795, 8vo.

[2] *Sozom.* h. e. II. 6. *Philostorg.* h. e. II. 5.

[3] *Socrat.* h. e. II. 41.

[4] *Cyrill.* Catech. 10, 19; 13, 40.

This conversion was mainly effected by the labors of Ulfila,[1] their great apostle and bishop.

He was the descendant of a noble Gothic house, and was sent as a hostage to Constantinople, shortly after the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, and while in the capital embraced Christianity. He accepted it, with simple and earnest faith, just as he found it, putting aside all the idle and speculative questions that distracted the religious mind of that age. Having returned among his countrymen, he for a time held the office of lector; but, having shortly afterward invented Gothic characters, he set to work on a *Gothic translation of the Bible*,[2] most of which has been preserved to us, bearing ample testimony to the ability with which the work was done.

When *Theodosius* commanded all the subjects of the Roman Empire to accept the Nicene Creed, the Goths, animated by a spirit of bitter hostility to the Romans, refused to give up the teachings of Arianism.

From the Visigoths the Arian heresy spread rapidly among *Ostrogoths* and the *Vandals*, the Burgundians and the Suevi, all of whom obliged the Catholics among whom they chanced to settle, to embrace its teachings.[3]

On the death of Valens, Gratian compelled the Goths to submit to his authority (A. D. 379–380), and *St. John Chrysostom*, Patriarch of Constantinople, taking advantage of this favorable turn in affairs, set to work with characteristic zeal and energy to spread the knowledge of Christianity more generally among them. He provided Gothic missionaries in the very city of Constantinople, and set apart a church in which divine worship was conducted in the Gothic language. The dedication of this church was the occasion of one of those eloquent discourses, so peculiar to the great orator, in which the miraculous conversion of these barbarous nations was adduced as a proof of the civilizing influence of the Gospel,[1] and as a verification of the prophecy of Isaias:[2] "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together." *St. Athanasius*, marveling at their conversion, cries out, in a spirit of triumphant joy: "Who has reconciled those who were formerly at deadly enmity with each other, and united them in the bonds of enduring peace, if it be not Jesus Christ, the Savior of all men, the Well-Beloved of God the Father, who, for our sakes and for our salvation, has deigned to suffer for all? The prophecy of Isaias, 'They shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles,' has been fulfilled, and, wonderful to relate, these people, by nature barbarians, who while they remained idolaters were ceaselessly engaged in deadly conflict against each other, never putting aside their arms, have since their conversion to Christianity given up their habits of war and devoted themselves to the peaceful cultivation of the fields."

---

[1] Wulfila, Wölflein or Little-wolf.

[2] *Socrat.* h. e. III. 33. *Sozom.* VI. 37. *Theodoret.* IV. 33. Ulfila's translation of the Bible, ed. by *Zahn*, Weissenfels, 1805; then, Ulfila's O. and N. Testam. fragm., etc., edd. de *Gabelentz* et *Loebe*, Vol. I. Altenburg, 1836, Vol. II. Lps. 1842–1847 (with a full Glossarium and Grammar of the Gothic language); thereto a Supplement, by *Loebe*. *Massmann*, The Holy Scriptures of the O. and N. T. in the Gothic language, with Greek and Latin text, annotations, Dictionary, and Hist. Introd. Stuttg. 1856. It is rather affirmed than denied that this *translation of the Bible* is free from Arian views; but, on the other hand, Arianism is most certainly found in Ulfila's *profession of faith*, with the remarkable addition: Ego Ulphila episcopus et confessor *semper* sic credidi. Conf. *Krafft*, l. c. p. 327–361. *Waitz*, in l. c. *Bessel*, in l. c.

[3] Conf. *Walch*, Hist. of Heretics, Part II., p. 553–569.

St. Jerome was still more surprised when, in his distant cave at Bethlehem, he received a letter from two Goths, by name *Sunnia* and *Fretella*,[3] begging him to state his opinion as to the merits of the Latin and Graeco-Alexandrian translations of the Bible, both of which varied somewhat from the original Hebrew.

"Who," says he, "would believe that the barbarous Goths study the oracles of the Holy Ghost in the text of the original Hebrew, while the listless Greeks appear to take no interest in such studies." Both of these fathers also testify that of the Goths under Athanaric, some bore witness to their faith, and proved the sincerity of their love of the Church, by suffering *martyrdom* rather than give up the doctrines which she had taught them.

---

[1] Homil. III. opp. *Chrysost.*, T. XII., ed. *Montfaucon.*

[2] Isaias, lxv. 25; cf. xi. 6.

[3] *Hieronym.* ep. 106. Quis hoc crederet, ut barbara Getarum lingua Hebraicam quaereret veritatem, et dormitantibus, immo contemnentibus Graecis ipsa Germania Spiritus Sti eloquia scrutaretur? (opp. T. I., p. 641.)

§ 149. *Christianity among the Visigoths. Their Kingdoms in Gaul and Spain.*

Jornandes, de rebus Geticis seu de Getarum (Gothorum) origine, c. 1–3, ed. *Stahlberg*, Hagen, 1859; ed. *Closs*, Stuttg. 1861. *Idoti*, chronicon in *Florez*, España sagrada, T. IV., p. 289–501; *Isidor. Hispal.* chronica regum Visigothorum. (opp. ed. *Arevelo*, T. VII., p. 185.) †*Aschbach*, History of the Visigoths, Frankft. 1827, 2 vols. *Helfferich*, The Arianism of the Visigoths, Berlin, 1860. †*Gams*, Ch. H. of Spain, Vol. II., p. 395 sq.

In the year 410, Rome was taken by the Visigoth Arians under *Alaric*, and if the disgraceful circumstances which preceded and led to its capture, have no parallel in the fall of any other city, neither have the moderation and generosity with which the conquerors treated the vanquished inhabitants of the once proud mistress of the world.

That the mildness and clemency exhibited by the Barbarians on this occasion are evidence of that humane feeling so characteristic of the Germans, there can be no doubt, but it is equally undeniable that these are in part to be ascribed to the civilizing influences of Christianity. Did not Æneas see, asks St. Augustine:

"Dying Priam at the shrine,
Staining the hearth he made divine?"

"But what was novel" (in the sack of Rome), continues the Bishop of Hippo, "was, that savage Barbarians should show themselves in so gentle a guise, that the largest churches were chosen and set apart to be filled with those to whom quarter was given; that in them none were slain and none forcibly dragged out; that into them many were led by their relenting enemies to be set at liberty, and that from them none were led into slavery by merciless foes. Whoever fails to see," he adds, "that this is to be attributed to the name of Christ, and to the Christian temper, is blind; whoever sees this, and gives not thanks to God, is ungrateful; and whoever hinders any one from praising it, is mad. No prudent man will ascribe such clemency to Barbarians."[1]

Alaric quitted Rome, and it is somewhat difficult to satisfactorily account for his hasty departure.

The Goths, unable longer to maintain themselves in Italy, set out for Gaul, in the year 412, under the leadership of *Ataulf*, where they founded a kingdom between the Loire and Garonne, of which *Wallia* became the King, and *Toulouse* the capital, and which, after a few years, extended over the greater part of Spain.[2] This was the first kingdom established in Europe by the Germans, and was, even after it had assumed a distinctively Christian character, conspicuous for deeds of barbaric violence, which were usually followed by the more terrible scourges of pestilence and famine.

Of the Vandals, Alani, and Suevi, the first conquerors of Spain, only these last were Catholics, and even they adopted the Arian heresy in the year 464, after King *Remismond* had married the daughter of the Visigoth Theodoric. They then began their work of pillage by sacking cities, pulling down churches, and putting to death Catholic bishops and priests, many of whom, such as *Pancratian* of *Braga*, *Patanius*, and others, suffered martyrdom for their faith, and in their singular fortitude and courageous death, left a rich heritage of glory to the Spanish Church.

The condition of the Church under the Visigoth King *Eurich* († A. D. 476), was, if possible, still more deplorable.

Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont, states that, "Eurich sent great numbers of Catholic bishops into exile, and prohibited the election of others to take their places. Thus, he goes on to say, the churches of both Gaul and Spain, having been deprived of their pastors, rapidly went to ruin, grass grew about the sanctuaries and on the very altars, and beasts of prey took up their abode among the rubbish of those desecrated temples.[3]

---

[1] *Aug.* De Civit. Dei I. 1–7. *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, Vol. I., p. 147–168. *Reumont*, Hist. of the City of Rome, Vol. I., p. 734 et sq.

[2] *Rosenstein*, Hist. of the Kingdom of the Visigoths in Gaul, 1859.

[3] *Sidon.* lib. VII. ep. 6. ad Bas. *Sirmondi*, opp. T. I. max. bibl. PP. T. VI.

Alaric, the son of Eurich (A. D. 506), though himself an Arian, adopted toward the Catholics a more lenient policy than that which his father had pursued; but under *Leovigild* the horrors of persecution were again revived, and so violent was the temper of this prince, that he put to death his own son, *Hermenegild*, on Easter Sunday, A. D. 585, at Tarragona, for embracing and refusing to give up the Catholic faith.

His son and successor, *Reccared* (A. D. 586–601), who had more sympathy with the doctrines for which his brother had shed his blood than with the unnatural spirit of the father, who had outraged every parental instinct, always regarded the Catholic Church with no small degree of favor, and in the year 587 made a full and open profession of her teachings, in a council composed of both Catholic and Arian bishops. The *Council of Toledo*, held A. D. 589, struck the final blow against the Arianism of the Goths, upon which it passed thirty-nine anathemas. The Church now sprung into new life, and flourished with great splendor, under the distinguished Hispano-Gothic bishops, *Helladius* of Toledo, *Isidore* of Seville (†A. D. 636), *Ildephonse the Younger*, Archbishop of Toledo, and others. The *seventeen Synods of Toledo*, held between A. D. 400 and 694, are ample evidence of the growth and prosperity of the Church, of the revival of religious life, and of the political progress of the nation.

§ 150. *The Vandals in Africa.*

Victor episcopus Vitensis, who was an eye-witness of what he relates (487), wrote libb. V. historiae persecutionis Africanae sub Genserico et Hunnerico Vandalor. regib. ed. *Chifletius*, *S. J.*, Divione, 1664, 4to. (Hist. persecutionis Vandal. ed. *Ruinart*, Paris, 1694, 8vo.; Venet. 1732, 4to., max. bibl. PP. T. VIII. p. 675 sq.) *St. Fulgentii* episc. Ruspensis vita (by Ferrandus, his scholar?) max. bibl. PP. T. IX. *Procopius Caesareensis* (first, teacher of rhetoric, then legal counselor of Belisar, may be styled the Byzantine Herodotus), historiarum libb. VIII. (Persian, Vandalic, and Gothic Memorabilia) ed. gr. and lat. ex. ed. *Claudii Maltreti*, Paris, 1662, sq. fol., Venet. 1729 (corpus scriptor. Byzant.) In German, by *Kannegiesser*, Greifswalde, 1827, sq. 4 vols.; Vol. II. on the Vandals. Conf. *Dahn*, on Procopius of Caesarea, Berlin, 1865; the *same*, Kings of the (ancient) Germans, Munich, 1860. *Isidor. Hispal.*, historia Vandalorum et Suevorum.

Galland. bibl. T. X. *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 58. *Gregor. Turon.* hist. Francor. II. 25. *Kaufmann*, The Works of C. Apoll. Sidon., Götting. 1864; *Chaix*, St. Sidoin. Apollinaire et son siècle, Paris, 1867.

---

†*Morcelli*, Africa christ. Brixiae, 1816, 3 T. 4to. †*Papencordt*, Hist. of Vandalic rule in Africa, Berlin, 1838. *Katerkamp*, Vol. III., p. 333 sq. *Neander*, Memorabilia, Vol. III., Pt. I.

We have no knowledge of the circumstances or motives that induced the Vandals to embrace the Arian heresy, but we do know that, having set out from their old home in Pannonia in company with the Suevi and Alani, they emigrated to Spain, where they wrought such devastation that they are justly entitled to the distinction of being called the most cruel of all the Germanic tribes (A. D. 409).

When *Boniface*, the Roman governor of Africa, who had been for some time conscious that he held his office by a very insecure tenure, learned at length that he had been accused, and, through the powerful influence of his personal enemies at the Court of Ravenna, found guilty of high treason and deposed, his indignation knew no bounds. Yielding to the impulses of revenge, he raised the standard of rebellion, and, disregarding the advice and prayers of St. Augustine, called to his assistance the neighboring Vandals from Spain. The Vandals, who had found it difficult to maintain themselves in Spain, gladly accepted the invitation, and passed over to Africa, under their King, *Geiseric* (Genseric), to the number of fifty, or, as some say, eighty thousand. In doing so, however, their intention was to conquer the fair provinces of this country for themselves, rather than to aid in the work of establishing the independent authority of Count Boniface.

Boniface soon discovered his error, but not till it was too late to provide a remedy. The richest provinces of Rome and the granary of Italy passed into the hands of the Barbarians. Geiseric immediately set on foot a persecution of the Catholics, which lasted throughout the whole course of his long and infamous reign (A. D. 427–477),[1] and surpassed in brutal cruelty and refined torture, if possible, even that of Diocletian. Bishops and priests were expelled the country, and those who refused to go were sold into slavery. Many fled to Rome, but were not even here beyond the reach of the terrible Geiseric, who in the year 455 sat down with his savage hordes[1] before the walls of that city. So great were the evils that came upon the Christians, that some began to entertain doubts in regard to the truth of an overseeing Providence in the affairs of men; and *Salvian*, Bishop of Marseilles, feeling that there was a call upon him to correct this error, composed a work specially devoted to its refutation. This Christian Jeremias took the ground that these divine visitations were but the just chastisements of an avenging God upon a reprobate people, whose degeneracy and immorality were in striking contrast with the singular purity and vigor of the Germanic nations.

---

[1] *Herm. Schulze*, De Testamento Genserici, 1859.

Under *Huneric* (A. D. 477–484), the son and successor of Geiseric, who had married Eudoxia, the widow of Valentinian III., the Catholics enjoyed a short interval of peace, for which, however, they were indebted to the humane offices of the emperor Zeno. *Eugene*, who was distinguished alike for his piety and firmness of character, became Bishop of Carthage, A. D. 479, after the see had remained vacant for the space of twenty-four years. But the Arian bishop, *Cyrilla*, who besides being unscrupulous, was skilled in the arts of intrigue, assailed Eugene with such bitterness, that the latter, together with five thousand Catholics, was obliged to put up with all manner of indignity, and to suffer the most inhuman cruelty. *The Catholics of Sicca and Lara, notwithstanding that they were shut up in a small room, and enduring a martyrdom of torture in every member of their bodies, sang, without ceasing, hymns in honor of Christ; while many of those who had their tongues cut out at Tipasa still retained the power of speech, and raised their voices in praise and thanksgiving to God.*[2]

A conference held at Carthage, A. D. 484, composed of Catholic and Arian bishops, in the hope of adjusting difficulties, served only to augment them, and to add to the already severe sufferings of the Catholics.

---

[1] See *Kraus*, Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 214. (Tr.)

[2] Even *Mr. Gibbon*, who never looks beyond the *natural*, has been obliged to admit the truth of this wonderful fact, because of his inability to impeach the historical testimony on which it rests. *Victor*. Vitens. V. 6; *Procopius* de Bello Vand. I. 8. (opp. ed. Bonn, I. 345); *Evagrius*, IV. 14. The testimony of the Platonist, *Aeneas Gaza*, on the overthrow of the Vandalic domination, is given by *Theophrastus* in *Galland*, T. X., p. 636. Emperor *Justinian* also states (in Cod. L. I. tit. 27. de officio praefecti praetorio Afric.): "Vidimus venerabiles viros, qui, abscissis radicitus linguis, poenas suas mirabiliter loquebantur." *Tillemont*, T. XVI., and *Schröckh*, Ch. Hist., Pt. 18, p. 101 et sq.

Guntamund (A. D. 494), convinced that the most sanguinary and persistent persecution would be inadequate to the task of entirely eradicating the Church from the soil of Africa, permitted the exiled bishops to return one by one to their dioceses; but *Thrasamund* (A. D. 496–523), who was of quite another opinion, commenced anew the work, interrupted by the clemency and judgment of his predecessor, and forbade, but to no purpose, the consecration of Catholic bishops. Seeing that their number, instead of falling off, was daily on the increase, he adopted a more summary method of ridding himself of their presence, and sent one hundred and twenty of them into exile in Sardinia. Among them was *Fulgentius*, Bishop of *Ruspe*, one of the most intrepid and learned defenders of the Catholic faith.

The Church again enjoyed a short respite from the horrors of persecution, under *Hilderic*, a prince whose humanity cost him his life. He was assassinated by his cousin, *Gilimer*.

The Catholics were saved from the consequences of a fresh persecution, which threatened to be as sanguinary as any that had preceded it, by the timely interference of the emperor, *Justinian*, who sent *Belisarius* into Africa to protect and defend them.

This general had little difficulty in overthrowing the domination of the Vandals in Africa; for these rude warriors, once they had come fully under the influence of the polished manners and luxurious life of the Carthaginians, became, from a valiant and comparatively pure people, the most effeminate and corrupt of mankind. Thus Africa passed again under the authority of Rome (A. D. 533), and all hope of the Catholic Church being re-established in that country by means of Germanic influence was at an end. After the year 670, every trace of Christianity disappeared before the advancing power of Islamism, and an event so unique in the history of the Church can only be accounted for by ascribing it to the inscrutable designs of Divine Providence.

§ 151. *The Burgundians and Their Relations to the Church.*

(*Plancher.*) histoire de Bourgogne, Dijon, 1739. Collatio episcopor. praesert. Aviti Vienn. coram rege Gundebaldo (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg. T. III. *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 59.) *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. I., p. 253 sq. *Gelpke*, Ch. H. of Switzerland under Roman, Burgundian, and Alemannian rule, Berne, 1856. *Derischweiler*, Hist. of the Burgundians until their incorporation into the Frankish kingdom, Münster, 1863. *Binding*, The Burgundo-Roman Kingdom, Lps. 1868.

The *Burgundians*, who dwelt between the Oder and the Vistula, issuing from their northern home, followed the route over which the Goths had passed, till they came as far as the Danube, where they encountered the Gepidae and the Romans. Retreating before the superior strength of these two peoples, they settled on the banks of the upper Main and the Neckar, and were here thrown into contact with the Alemanni (A. D. 406), with whom they were continually at war. They were forced by the terror of Attila's arms to break up their settlement on the Rhine, and, retreating in a southwesterly direction, they entered the country of the Jura, about A. D. 412, and founded a kingdom in Gaul, extending from the Alps to the Rhône and the Saone, of which *Lyons* became the capital. It is thought, but the opinion rests on very questionable authority, that they became converts to the Catholic Church as early as the year 417. Be this as it may, it is certain that no great reliance could be placed on the sincerity of their conversion, otherwise it would be difficult to account for the readiness with which they embraced the Arian heresy, about the year 444, during the reign of *Gundobald*.[1]

This prince, unable to resist the cogency and strength of the arguments of *Patiens*, Bishop of Lyons, but particularly of those of *Avitus*, Bishop of Vienne, expressed a wish to enter the Catholic Church, but desired to have his conversion kept a secret, from fear of drawing on himself the enmity of his son Theodoric. His son *Sigismund* exhibited greater resolution and more character than his father, and, at the desire of the Franks, returned to the Catholic Church. After the year 517, his example was followed by many of the Burgundians, among whom Arianism entirely disappeared, once they had passed under the dominion of the Franks, during the reign of *Godomar* (A. D. 534).

---

[1] *Oros.* hist. adv. Pagan. VII. 32, 38. *Socr.* h. e. VII. 30, III. 30. Conf. *Pagi* crit. ad a. 413, n. 13, and *Prosper* in Chron. ad a. 435.

§ 152. *Ravages of the Huns in Germany, Gaul, and Italy.*

Thierry, King Attila and his Age, Lps. 1852. *Neumann*, The Nations of Southern Russia and their Historical Development, 2d ed., Lps. 1855. *John von Müller*, Journeys of the Popes. See also Vol. I., p. 676, note 4.

The nations of which we have just spoken had suffered more from the attacks of the Huns than from those of any other people, and were at length obliged to retire before their advancing columns. The Huns were the rudest of all the Slavic nations of which we have any knowledge. *Attila*, their leader, whose name is indissolubly associated with devastation and ruin, marched through Germany and into Gaul at the head of a vast multitude, composed of nations which he had reduced to subjection and forced to follow his standard, and with this incongruous army commenced an attack upon the united kingdom of the Visigoths and Franks (A. D. 444).

The Rhenish cities of Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Spire, Strasbourg, and the neighboring cities of Treves, Metz, and others, were almost entirely destroyed, and their churches demolished. Checked by the doubtful results of the battle of *Châlons-sur-Marne* (451), and awed by the commanding presence and resolute attitude of *Lupus*, Bishop of Troyes, Attila directed his course toward Italy, and by the might of his arms added to the disasters with which this unfortunate country was already so severely scourged (A. D. 452). He stormed and sacked Aquileia, burned and plundered many other cities, and was only stayed in his career of blood and fire, and prevented from carrying the terror of his arms to the walls of Rome, by the great *St. Leo*, who undertook an embassy to his camp. As the resolution of Lupus and Leo had proved more effectual in curbing the anger of this ferocious barbarian than either armed resistance or mercenary tribute, the fact gave rise to the saying that "only a wolf or a lion could withstand Attila."

Attila, it is said, returned to the Danube, and died in the following year, A. D. 453. His numerous and terrible army, destitute of the only man who possessed sufficient ability and resolution to make his authority respected among its anomalous masses, broke through all the restraints of discipline and wandered over the face of the country, carrying destruction wherever they went. It required a *higher* than a human power to protect Christendom against so terrible a scourge.

And, indeed, it would seem that Divine grace, which flowed in upon the Church in abundant streams during this age, was more than sufficient to overcome the power of sin and wickedness which lay like a foul mist upon the face of the earth. It was then that God raised up in defense of his cause those great lights of the Church and pillars of truth, *St. Leo the Great*, *St. Lupus* of Troyes, *St. Germanus* of Auxerre,[1] *St. Severin*,[2] that mysterious person whose origin and early his-

---

[1] Conf. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XVII., p. 421 sq.

[2] *Eugippii*, Vita St. Severini (*Bolland.* Acta Sanctor. mens. Jan., Tom. I., p. 483) ed. *Kerschbaumer*, Scaphus. 1862; in *Friedrich's* Ch. Hist. of Germany, Vol. I., Appendix, p. 439–489, according to Munich manuscripts, transl. into German, with Introduction and Annotations by *C. Ritter*, Linz, 1853. Conf. *Friedrich*, l. c., p. 358–383.

The Life of St. Severin, by his disciple Eugippius, is of inestimable value, as it contains information of the condition of things in that age which could be obtained from no other source; for the Danubian provinces may be said to have been shrouded in utter darkness during the period immediately preceding and the period immediately following the life of these two men. From no other source could we obtain so abundant information of the then flourishing condition of Christianity, and the complete organization of the Church in the Roman provinces to the south of the Danube. It is certainly providential, that, just on the eve of the decline of these provinces, a work should be left us which describes so graphically, and with so much detail, the state of the country and the characteristics of its inhabitants. (*Wattenbach*, Germany's Sources of History, p. 34.)

That St. Severin was of noble extraction, there can be no doubt, and it is not unlikely that he belonged to the last of the ruling houses of Rome. Inspired with the desire of laboring in the cause of Christ among the oppressed inhabitants of Noricum, he withdrew into solitude and obscurity. He practiced the most extreme austerities, went barefoot during the most inclement seasons, and, though he observed excessive fasts, quite forgot himself in his desire to supply the food of life to the famishing souls of those about him. He went up and down the country exhorting and preaching penance, comforting the distressed, and alleviating, as best he could, the wants of the needy. He regularly exacted tithes of those who could pay them, for the support of the poor and the redemptory no one seemed to know, and those other great men who rivaled the zeal and the glory of St. Severin—*St. Honoratus* and *St. Hilary* of Arles, *Eucherius* of Lyons, and others no less distinguished. All these exercised an influence which Attila and the other leaders of barbarous hordes found it impossible to resist.

§ 153. *The Ostrogoths and Lombards in Italy.*

Jornandes, de rebus Geticis. *Procopii Caes.* historiar. libb. IV–VIII. (in Germ. by *Kannegiesser*, Vols. 3 and 4.) *Aurel. Cassiodori* Variarum (epistolarum) lib. XII. et Chronicon (consulare). *Pauli Warnefridi* de gestis Longobardor. libb. VI. (*Muratori*, scriptor. Ital. T. I. *Gregor. M.* epp. opp. Paris, 1705, T. II.) *Manso*, Hist. of the Ostrogothic Empire, Breslau, 1824. *Sartorius*, Hist. of the Ostrogoths, transl. into German, Hamb. 1811, from the French of *du Roure*, histoire de Théodoric le Grand, Paris, 1846, 2 vols. *Gregorovius*, Hist. of Rome during the M. A., Vol. I., p. 273 sq. *v. Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II., p. 1–127. *Dahn*, Germanic Kings. *Koch-Sternfeld*, The Kingdom of the Lombards in Italy, according to Paul Warnefr., Munich, 1839. *Flegler*, The Kingdom of the Lombards in Italy, Lps. 1851.

Even *Odoacer*, the leader of the Heruli,[1] the conqueror of Italy, and the destroyer of the Roman Empire (A. D. 476), was subdued by the presence of the mysterious St. Severin. His reign came to an end after the Ostrogoths, under the leadership of *Theodoric*, had issued from Pannonia (A. D. 488), and conquered Italy and Sicily, Rhaetia and Noricum, Vindelicia and Dalmatia, and established a vast empire, whose authority extended over all these countries. But, for the space of eleven years, during which the reign of Odoacer lasted, the Catholic Church enjoyed, through his indulgence, the blessings of comparative peace; and this notwithstanding that he was himself an Arian.

Although both Theodoric and his people embraced the Arian heresy, his policy toward the Catholic Church was characterized by humanity and moderation, and not unfre-

---

tion of captives. His authority was great in the land, and it was said that the elements and the lower orders of beings were obedient to his command, and that the wrath of God overtook all who would not hearken to his words. *Kraus*, Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages. (Tr.)

[1] *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XVII., p. 474 sq. *Eugippii* Vita Severini, c. 14.

quently by justice and impartiality. In pursuing this course he was guided by the prudent counsel of *Cassiodorus*, his wise and learned chancellor.

During the reign of Theodoric, Italy enjoyed a measure of her former prosperity; the clouds that had so long darkened the land were broken, and for a season her fair fields bloomed as of old, and Rome herself was called the Happy City (*Roma Felix*). Theodoric's treatment of the Romanians was considerate and just. He protected them against the oppression of the Goths, and secured to them the benefits of their ancient rights, laws, and institutions. But toward the close of his reign, which lasted thirty-six years, incensed at a law passed against the Arians by Justin, the Roman emperor of the East, he revenged himself upon the Catholics of his own dominions, whom he pursued with tyrannical severity. He cast Pope *John* into prison, where the latter languished for awhile, and finally died, A. D. 526. He also put to death, for crimes of which they were declared guilty on the testimony of suborned witnesses, *Symmachus*, his father-in-law, and *Boëthius*,[1] both men of consular dignity. While in confinement, Boëthius enjoyed as best he could the consolation afforded by science and religion, and has left his thoughts on these subjects to posterity, in his admirable work entitled "*On the Consolation of Philosophy.*"

Theodoric died A. D. 526, and under his successors the persecution against the Catholics in a great measure ceased. *Amalasuntha*, the daughter of Theodoric, who governed in the name of her son, *Athalaric*, a minor, succeeded to her father; but after the death of her son, she shared the throne with her cousin, *Theodotus*, by whom she was murdered. The emperor *Justinian*, under pretense of avenging this murder, sent his general, *Narses*, at the head of an imperial army, into Italy, and after an eighteen years war (A. D. 535–553), destroyed the Ostrogothic empire. Italy became a Roman province, and was governed by *exarchs* who resided at *Ravenna*, of whom Narses was the first and Longinus the second. So complete was the overthrow of the Visigoths, that in a short time the very name of this gallant people disappeared.

---

[1] On Boëthius and Cassiodorus, see *Alzog's* Patrology, 2d ed., p. 413–418; and, on the latter, also *Montalembert*, Monks of the West, Vol. I., p. 348–356, German Transl., Vol. II., p. 77–88.

In the year 568, the *Lombards*, under the command of their king, *Alboin*, entered Italy, either of their own accord, or, as is more probable, at the invitation of Narses, who had been deeply offended by the empress. Leaving Pannonia, they crossed the Carnian Alps, and, with the aid of twenty thousand Saxons and some other hordes, took possession of the whole of Northern Italy, in whose fertile fields they permanently settled, and gave to it their own name. It would seem that Providence had decreed that there should not remain a single Roman province in the West. Pavia fell into the hands of the conquerors after a siege of three years, and after the death of Alboin, who was assassinated at the instigation of his wife, *Rosamond*, his successors gradually extended the empire to the south, till it comprehended nearly the entire Italian peninsula. All that remained to the Byzantines were the duchies of Rome and Naples, a few cities on the Ligurian and Adriatic coasts, such as Venice and the exarchate of Ravenna, and the tongue of land on the south-east of the peninsula.

This was, both for the Church and for Italy, a season of unspeakable misery. The Arian Lombards, who possessed neither the versatility nor the humanity of the Goths, on the one hand, exhibited no inclination or fitness for political organization, and, on the other, manifested the most violent hatred of the Catholics whom they found in the country. This will account both for the interregnum of ten years which followed the assassination of *Kleph*, the successor to Alboin, during which the country was governed by thirty-six dukes, and for their cruel persecution of the Catholics of Italy. At the close of the ten years, it was found necessary to restore the office of king, and *Flavius Antharis*, the son of Kleph, ascended the throne. He had married *Theodolinda* (Dietlinde), a Bavarian princess, through whose influence the condition of the orthodox Catholics was very considerably ameliorated. She herself professed the Catholic faith, and labored with zeal in the work of converting the Arian Lombards. On the death of her husband (A. D. 590), Theodolinda, in compliance with the wish of the Lombard lords, took the reins of power into her own hands, and shortly after associated Duke *Agilulf* with herself in the government of the kingdom.[1]

GREGORY THE GREAT, A. D. 590–604.

This favorable condition of affairs should be attributed, in a great measure, to the prudent counsels of Gregory the Great,[2] whom God seems to have raised up at this period to be the protector of Italy and the guardian of the Church. Descended from the senatorial and wealthy house of the Anicii, he soon became so distinguished for integrity of character, for his varied literary and scientific attainments, and for those graces and accomplishments so becoming, if not absolutely necessary, to one in his condition of life, that he rapidly rose in favor till he reached the high and honorable office of Praetor of Rome. Such distinctions, though highly attractive and capable of yielding an honest satisfaction to an upright mind, were not to Gregory's liking. He felt that God was calling him to a higher, a holier, and a purer life, and still he hesitated. But the struggle was soon past, and Gregory surrendered himself, with characteristic generosity, to the influence of grace. He devoted his wealth to the endowment of six new monasteries in Sicily, and established a seventh in his own palace, upon the Coelian Hill, at Rome, which he had *inherited* from his father, and in which he himself became a monk. All Rome was amazed to behold one, who formerly went forth with all the circumstance of a great dignitary of state, clad in costly robes and decked with jewels, now walk the streets of the city with the unassuming air of a beggar, and dressed in the coarse habit of an humble follower of St. Benedict.

---

[1] *Kraus*, Ch. H. of the M. A., pp. 215, 216.

[2] His biography by *Joannes* eccl. Rom. diacon. and *Paul Warnefrid.* in *Gregor. M.* opp. ed. *St. Marthe*, Paris, 1705, 4 T. fol. (in T. IV.) locupl. *Gallicioli*, Venet. 1768, 17 T. 4to. *Alzog's* Patrology, 2d ed., p. 420–427. *Palma*, praelect. h. e. T. II., Pt. I., p. 44–86. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XX., p. 346 sq. *Lau*, Gregory the Great, Lps. 1845. *Böhringer*, Ch. H. in Biographies, Vol. I., Pt. IV., p. 310–426. *Herder*, Thoughts on the Hist. of Mankind, Pt. IV., p. 109.

Like all noble and generous souls, Gregory, as soon as he had taken the obligations of a monk upon himself, determined to keep faith with himself and with his God. He practiced the most severe austerities; applied himself to the study of Holy Scripture; read, wrote, and prayed, and observed so strict a fast that his health finally gave away. His only food had been pulse, which his mother, who had become a nun since the death of her husband, prepared for him, and sent to his monastery, but he was now obliged to take more substantial food. At the request of Pope Benedict I., but much against his own will and inclination, Gregory quitted his monastery in the year 577 to become one of the seven cardinal-deacons, or *regionaries,* who presided over the seven principal divisions of Rome. It cost him still greater pain to accede to the wishes of Pope Pelagius II., who sent him as *Apocrisiarius,* or Nuncio, to the court of the Emperor Tiberius, at Constantinople. He was accompanied on this mission by several monks, and with them observed, as nearly as he could, the rule of his order, and applied himself to reading and study.

He nevertheless discharged his duties with marked ability, and succeeded in restoring the friendly relations between the Holy See and the Byzantine Court, which had been interrupted by the invasion of the Lombards.

His eminent talents for business, his learning, his piety, his rigor toward himself, his watchful care over the conduct of others, and his solicitude and energy in guarding and defending the interests of the Church, pointed him out as one who would discharge the duties of the Pontifical office with honor and distinction, and he was accordingly raised to this great dignity on the death of Pelagius, A. D. 590. It is to him that the Catholic Church of the West is indebted for her august liturgy and the splendor of her worship, for the solemn majesty and sweet melody of her chant, and for the extinction of the schism which had arisen out of the *Three Chapters,*[1] and which for a time threatened to cut off from the body of the Church the bishops of Venetia and Istria. It is to him also that the Anglo-Saxon Church owes her origin.

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 623.

Gregory had but one object in view in all his undertakings, and that was the exaltation and glory of the Church. "My honor," he writes, "is the honor of the whole Church; my honor is to behold my brethren (the bishops) filled with single-minded and earnest energy (*solidus vigor*). Then only do I feel that I enjoy true honor, when the honor due to all is denied to none."[1]

Besides being a model monk and a model churchman, Gregory the Great was also the most distinguished writer of his age. His writings have largely contributed to secure for him the title of *Great*, and have been, in a great measure, the source of the powerful influence which he has exerted upon the Church from his own day to ours.

When he ascended the Papal throne, the morality of the clergy was greatly relaxed, and to his active energy and the example of his own life is again due the purity of morals which characterized the ecclesiastics of every grade, at the close of his pontificate.

That he fully appreciated what a true priest should be, is abundantly proved by his work, entitled the "*Pastoral*," containing rules concerning the vocation, life, and teaching of pastors; and that he had sufficient courage, self-denial, and resolution to put these rules into practice in his own case, is manifest from the history of his life. Gregory's experience, personal holiness, and insight into character, enabled him to detect those among his clergy who were imbued with his own spirit and love of virtue. He sent men of this character into every part of Italy to provide for the wants of all, and to eradicate, by the power of the word of God, the traces of Paganism which were here and there beginning to appear.

His vigilance in watching over the rights of the priesthood, and his zeal in defending them when attacked, were not confined to one district or country, but extended, as was fitting, over the whole Church of which he was the Supreme Pastor. He corrected numerous abuses; caused *orphan asylums* and

---

[1] **Epistolar. lib. VIII., ep. 30, ad Eulogium.**

schools for the poor, institutions hitherto unknown, to be erected in many and distant lands,—an ample evidence that his tender solicitude and paternal care were as wide as the limits of the Church, and as deep as her charity.

A man of such untiring activity and such stirring energy, who exerted so deep and lasting influence upon the destinies of the Church, well deserved the title of *Great*, which his contemporaries cheerfully conferred upon him, and which has been confirmed by the universal verdict of posterity.

His strenuous efforts to defend the rights, privileges, and institutions of the Church, commanded the respect and elicited the admiration of even the Arian Lombards. Owing to the ceaseless wars waged against each other by the Greek exarchs and the Lombard princes, the hatred of the Italians against their northern conquerors had grown so deep and intense, that St. Gregory, if he would, could at any moment have called his countrymen to arms, brought about a universal uprising, and precipitated a general war. But he preferred the more lasting, if less brilliant, honors which attach to the office of mediator, to the doubtful glory of an unsuccessful warrior.[1] He asked both parties to consider the consequences of further prolonging the struggle. "What," said he, "can be the result of continuing the contest other than the destruction of many thousand men, who, whether they be Lombards or Romans, would be more usefully employed in tilling the fields."

He died March 12, A. D. 604, a martyr to his indefatigable zeal and restless activity, having, according to *Herder*, gone through more work in the same length of time than any ten of the secular or ecclesiastical princes of his age were capable of.

In the next century, when the Lombards, under kings *Luitprand* and *Rachis*, were again threatening the reduction and sacking of Rome, Pope *Zachary* (A. D. 741–752), mindful of the example of his ~~successor~~, the great Leo, went on an embassy to Pavia and Perugia, and at the former place obtained assurances of peace, and at the latter a promise that his city should not be besieged. Nay, so great an influence did his presence exert, that *Rachis*, a few days later, laid down the Iron Crown, and retired with his wife, the princes and princesses of his family, to the monastery of St. Benedict.[1]

---

[1] Epist. lib. IV., ep. 47.

§ 154. *Benedict of Nursia—Western Monasticism.*

Mabillonii annales Ord. St. Bened. (to 1157, Paris, 1703–1739), Luc. 1739–1745, 6 T. fol. in the Praef. saec. I., p. 7: Observationes de monachis in Occid. ante Benedictum. *Dacherii* et *Mabillonii* acta Sanctor. Ord. St. Bened. (to 1100), Paris, 1668–1701, 9 T. fol. The Life of St. Benedict in *Gregor. M.* dialog. lib. II. opp. ed. Bened., T. II., p. 207–276. Compare also *Bolland.* acta SS. mens. Martii., T. III., p. 247 sq. The *Rule* of St. Benedict. in *Holstenii* cod. regul. monast., T. I., p. 111–137; Germ. Transl. by Father *Charles Brandes*, in his Benedictine Library: Life of St. Benedict, his Rule and Explanation of it. Our Lady of Hermits, 1856–1858, 2d ed., 1863, 3 small vols. The *same*, The *Benedictine Order* and its world-wide influence (Tübg. Quarterl., 1851, p. 1–40) †**Montalembert*, les Moines de l'Occident, 5 vols., Paris, 1860; Engl. transl. by *Mrs. Oliphant*, London, 5 vols.; American ed., Boston, 1872, 2 vols., Vol. I., p. 305–345; *Germ.* Transl. by *Charles Brandes*, O.S.B., Ratisbon, 1860–1868, Vol. II., p. 1–73.

The *Order of St. Benedict*, which was but a fresh manifestation of the principle of Divine energy, residing and constantly at work in the Church, came into existence at a time when both Church and State were threatened with irremediable disasters by the continued incursions of the Barbarians. This order not only saved the Church from the calamities with which she was then menaced, but also gave her the assurance of a new lease of life, imparted to her fresh vigor, and inspired, fostered, and preserved that wealth of spiritual culture which has been a blessing to all succeeding ages.

The first monks that had been seen in the West were *Ammonius* and *Isidore*, who accompanied *St. Athanasius*, when this great bishop came to Rome to invoke the protection of Pope Julius. While this heroic man was passing his exile in Gaul, he had an opportunity, of which he promptly availed himself, of adding to the glory he had already won by his noble defense of the divinity of Christ, that of animating the West with a holy reverence and a religious zeal for the monastic life; and the love of self-denial and austerity inspired by his eloquence was kept alive and fostered by the examples of holiness so graphically set forth in his Life of St. Anthony. In Italy, the elements of monastic life were brought into shape, adjusted, and organized by *Eusebius* of Vercelli, *Ambrose* of Milan, and *Jerome; Augustine* was eloquent in its praise in Africa; *Martin*, Bishop of Tours,[1] introduced it into Northern, and *Cassian* into Southern Gaul.

---

[1] Edicta regum Longobardorum, ed *Vesme*, Aug. Taurinor., 1855. Conf. *John von Müller*, Journeys of Popes.

As early as A. D. 400, two thousand monks followed the mortal remains of St. Martin to the grave.

But the severity of the Western climate would not admit of so rigorous a discipline as that practiced with perfect impunity under the more genial skies of the East. It was, therefore, necessary to modify the Rule, and, as is usual under such circumstances, every one thought himself at liberty to introduce such changes as he conceived to be best suited to the conditions of the country and to the habits of the people. Changes so arbitrary, introduced at a time when the country was harassed by the invasions of the Barbarians and society upheaved, threatened the dismemberment of the Church and the destruction of monasticism. Happily, Providence gave to the Church at this time a man, destined to future celebrity, who drew order out of confusion, and established the monastic rule in the West on a solid and permanent basis; and thus rescued from destruction an institution whose services to religion from that day to this have been both extremely eminent and beneficial. This was BENEDICT, of the noble house of the Anicii, and, on his mother's side, the last scion of the lords of *Nursia*, a Sabine town, where he was born A. D. 480. He was put to school at Rome, where he received an excellent education for his years, but he felt ill at ease amid the corruption of that great city. At the early age of fourteen, he resolved to give up study, to break the ties of family, and to renounce the pleasures and allurements of the world. Bidding farewell to friends and home and all he held dear, he plunged into those almost inaccessible hills through which the river Anio forces its way, leaping from fall to fall, to the town of *Subiaco* (Sublaqueum.) On his way he met a monk, named *Romanus*, who gave him a haircloth shirt, and a monastic dress made of skins. Continuing on his way, he met an abrupt rock overhanging the course of the Anio, in which there was a dark and narrow cave, into which the sun never found its way. Here he remained three entire years, cut off from all the world, and unknown to all, except the monk Romanus, who supplied him with food, which he conveyed to the solitary by letting it down from the top of the rock by a rope, to which was attached a bell, to give warning that the scanty meal was at hand.

---

[1] *Sulpicii Severi*, de vita B. Martini lib.; dialogi tres, and epist. tres.; *Gregor. Turon.* de miracul. St. Martini. Conf. **Montalembert*, l. c. Amer. ed., Vol. I., p. 265–272; Germ. transl., Vol. I., p. 213–221. *Reinkens*, Martin of Tours, the wonder-working monk and bishop, Brsl. 1866.

But his place of concealment could not always remain a secret, and he was at length discovered by shepherds, who at first thought him a wild beast, but proclaimed him a great servant of God after the holy man had discoursed to them of the graces and mercies of Christ.

While here he was assailed by a terrible temptation. The memory of a lady whom he had formerly known continued to haunt him, and so great was the impression she had made upon him that he was on the point of leaving his retreat, when a great grace was poured in upon his soul, and, acting under its inspiration, he plunged naked into a clump of thorns and briers near his grotto, rolling about in them till he was one wound, and, amid the pains of the body, hushed forever the solicitations of passion.

The retreat of the young solitary was soon broken in upon. The people of the neighborhood came to ask his blessing, and the monks of the monastery near *Vicovaro* continued to importune him till he consented to become their abbot. They, however, soon tired of his austere severity, and attempted to rid themselves of him by poison. The attempt was discovered, for, when Benedict made the sign of the cross over the vessel, it burst in pieces.

Benedict again withdrew to his cavern; but the holiness of his life and the beauty of his example excited so much jealousy and hatred against him, that he resolved to leave forever a place his presence had so long sanctified.

He set out from Subiaco, and, directing his course along the western side of the Apennines and toward the south, he came at last to a magnificent mountain overlooking the river Liris (Garigliano) at its source, where he rested (A. D. 529). This is *Monte Cassino*.

Here St. Benedict built two chapels—one dedicated to St. John the Baptist, the first solitary of the new faith, and the other to St. Martin, the great bishop of Tours; and around these rose the monastery destined to become the most celebrated religious retreat of the Catholic world, where Benedict wrote the *Rule*, and from whence bishops and popes went forth to govern the Church by their prudence and wisdom, and to edify her children by their virtuous lives and illustrious examples. The life of labor, of prayer, and of meditation pursued by St. Benedict and his children contained the germ and served as the model of that more stately and complex organization into which his order developed at a later day.

His *Rule*, which contains seventy-three articles, is an abridgment of Christian doctrine, and embraces all the counsels of evangelical perfection. It is based on a thorough knowledge of human nature, and is characterized by a happy union of mildness and severity, of simplicity and prudence. Two leading principles run through every article of the *Rule*, viz., labor and obedience; and its spirit and aim seem to be to bring together all the members of a monastery into one family circle, with relations to each other as open and tender as those which exist between father and son or brother and brother.

The wisest of each community was chosen by the suffrages of his brethren to be set over them, and the name of *Father*, or *Abbas*, which he received on entering upon his duties, expressed the affectionate relations he held toward the others, who were called his *Brothers*.

The abbot was expected to teach by example rather than precept; to study carefully the character, disposition, and tastes of every member of the monastery over which he was set; to direct each as prudence might suggest; to temper mildness with severity, and to carefully abstain from manifesting any preference of one above another. The most efficacious checks to any temptation, on the part of the abbot, to abuse his authority, were an abiding sense of the dreadful *account* he would one day be called upon to render to God, and the holy and inviolable character of the *Rule* (*sancta regula*), which bound him equally with the lowest member of the community.

Next to the *abbot*, but subordinate to him, came the *prior* (praepositus), and, for the more complete and efficient direction of the monks, a *dean* was set over every ten of them.

The monks were instructed to regard their superiors as the representatives of Jesus Christ, and to obey them accordingly.

The *postulant* (pulsans), or one who applied for admission into the community, was to pass through a year's probation, or novitiate, during which the serious obligations of the life upon which he was about to enter were, as directed by the Rule, brought before his mind three successive times.

But the most radical innovation upon former customs was the duty of *residence* (*stabilitas loci*) enjoined by the fifty-eighth article of the Rule, which forbade the monks to pass from one house to another, and directed that each one should remain where he had made his vows.

St. Benedict was keenly alive to the dangers of a uniformly cloistered life, and wisely provided against them. He introduced among his monks the practice of alternate prayer and labor, and prescribed that, when not engaged in singing the praises of the Lord as set forth in the words of the psalm,[1] "Seven times a day have I sung thy praises," they should be *continually* engaged in *various* occupations, according to the talents, skill, and acquirements of each, such as manual labor, reading, transcribing manuscripts and books, and giving instructions to the young. He used frequently to remind his brethren that "they could not be truly monks unless they should live by the labor of their hands, like their fathers and the apostles."

The tendency of the age and the wisdom of the Rule of St.

---

[1] **cxviii. 164.**

Benedict soon attracted to his monastery a great number of young men. Among the most distinguished of his disciples were *Placidus* and *Maurus*, who labored energetically and assiduously to establish the order in Sicily and Gaul.

Gregory the Great, who was much attached to the order, exerted his powerful influence to further its interests, became himself a member of it, and wrote the *Life of St. Benedict* as a labor of love.

The life of the great saint of the West was drawing near its close, and he had already announced his approaching death to many of his monks then at a distance from Monte Cassino. On the sixth day of his illness he requested to be carried into the Chapel of St. John the Baptist, where, supported on the arms of his disciples, he received the Holy Viaticum; after which he was taken to the foot of the altar, and at the side of the grave in which he had directed his remains to be laid, standing erect, with hands extended to Heaven and a prayer upon his lips, he gave back his great and pure soul to God, March 21, A. D. 543. He was buried by the side of his sister, *Scholastica*, on the very spot where the altar of Apollo, which he had cast down, had stood.

"The results of Benedict's work," says Count de Montalembert, "were immense. In his lifetime, as after his death, the sons of the noblest races in Italy, and the best of the converted Barbarians, came in multitudes to Monte Cassino. They came out again, and descended from it, to spread themselves over all the West; missionaries and husbandmen who were soon to become the doctors and pontiffs, the artists and legislators, the historians and poets of the new world. . . . Less than a century after the death of Benedict, all barbarism had won from civilization was reconquered. And more still, his children took in hand to carry the Gospel beyond those limits which had confined the first disciples of Christ. . . . The West was saved. A new empire was founded; a new world began."[1]

---

[1] Monks of the West, American ed., Vol. I., p. 344. (Tr.)

§ 155. *Christianity among the Franks—Triumph of Catholicity.*

Gregor. Turon. Hist. Francor. *Ruinart*, Paris, 1699, fol. (*Bouquet*, T. II., p. 75, in *Migne's* ser. lat. T. 71.) Germ. transl. Würzb. 1848–1849; *von Giesebrecht*, Berlin, 1851, 2 vols. *Leibnitz*, de origine Francor., appended to *Eccard's* ed. of the Salic and Ripuarian Laws, Francof. 1720, fol. *Fredegar.* Chron. Conf. **Duchesne*, Hist. Franc. script. Paris, 1636–1649, 5 vols. **Bouquet*, Recueil des hist. de la Gaule, etc., Paris, 1738–1855, 21 vols. (Tr.) *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. I., p. 258 sq. *Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. II., p. 57–114. *Heber*, The Pre-Carlovingian Christian Heroes of the Faith on the Rhine, Frkft. 1858 W. *Junghans*, Hist. of the Frankish kings, Childeric and Chlodwic, Götting. 1867. *Bornhac*, Hist. of the Franks under the Merovingians, Greifswalde, 1863. *Ozanam*, la civilisation chrétienne chez les Francs, Paris, 1849. (Tr.)

It is probable that the *Franks* were acquainted with the Christian religion some considerable time before they made their final conquest of Gaul. Bands of these Frankish warriors were in the habit of crossing the Roman boundary of the Rhine, at first for purposes of plunder, and afterward in the hope of obtaining permanent settlement, and in this way were, for many years previously to their conversion to Christianity, brought into close and familiar intercourse with the current of thought and every-day life of the Romans. Moreover, many of them served in the armies of Rome.

These circumstances will serve to explain why the Frankish chieftains entertained so high an admiration of St. Ambrose, and ascribed to his friendship and good-will the victories of the Frankish Comes Arbogastus.

About the second half of the fifth century, the Franks had settled permanently in Gaul. They had divided into two principal branches of the *Salii*, who inhabited the country between the Scheldt and the Meuse, and the *Ripuarii*, who probably dwelt between the Meuse, Moselle, and Rhine.

Although they sacked and destroyed many cities, and carried desolation far and wide into the surrounding country, there is no evidence that they purposely oppressed the Christians or manifested any special dislike of their religion. On the contrary, it would seem that the Franks were, if not well disposed toward Christianity, at least tolerant of its practice; for, although they had possession of the cities of Cologne, Maestricht, Tongres, Treves, and Toul, not a single church was destroyed during their occupation; and it is, moreover, certain that Comes Arbogastus, who ruled, perhaps in the name of the Roman Empire, with sovereign authority, at Treves, as early as A. D. 470, was both a Frank and a Christian. Neither was the Christian religion unknown in the royal house of the Salii; for Lautechild and Audefleda, the daughters of *Childeric*, who died A. D. 481, the latter of whom was the wife of *Theodoric* of Bern, were Arians.

Here, as elsewhere, the triumph of the Church was brought about through the instrumentality of a Catholic prince.[1] This was *Chlodewig* (Clovis), the son of Childeric and chief of the Salic Franks (A. D.) 481–511), who, by his victory at Soissons, A. D. 486, over the Roman governor *Syagrius*, put an end to the Roman supremacy in Gaul.

He laid the *foundation of the monarchy of the Franks* in those provinces of which he had gained possession, and which lay between the Somme and the Seine, and extended to the south and east as far as the Loire and Rhone. His attention had already been directed to Christianity, to which he seemed much inclined, by his queen, *Clotilda*, a Burgundian princess.[2] When engaged in battle against the Alemanni, near the town of Tolbiacum, or *Zülpich*,[3] perceiving that the issue of the contest was doubtful, he made a vow to become a Christian if God should grant him the victory. After the leader of the Alemanni had fallen, the soldiers of the defeated army cried out: "*Spare us, O King; we are thy people.*"

Clovis was instructed in the Christian religion by *Vedastus* of Toul, and *St. Remigius* of Rheims, the apostle of the Franks, and on Christmas day, A. D. 496, received baptism at the hands of the latter. On this occasion, St. Remigius, addressing Clovis, and referring to the idols of Pagan and to the symbols of Christian worship, said: "Humble thyself, proud Sicambrian; burn now what thou didst formerly adore, and adore now what thou didst formerly burn."[1]

---

[1] *Gay*, Ste. Clotilde et les origines chrét. de la nation et monarchie française, Paris, 1867. *Bouquette*, Ste. Clotilde et son siècle, Paris, 1867.

[2] Clodewig (Clovis) had, at the request of his pious consort, consented, that, after his death, the heir-presumptive might receive baptism, and the same permission was granted to the second son in the event of the death of the heir-presumptive.

[3] It is more probable, as Junghans and others assert, that the place here mentioned is not Zülpich on the Lower, but *Alpich* in the Palatinate, on the Upper Rhine.

Three thousand noble Franks and a great number of Frankish ladies followed the example of Clovis, and were at once baptized by the attending bishops and clergy.

According to a legend of a more recent date,[2] the press of people was so great at the ceremony of the anointing and coronation of Clovis, that the attendant who bore the chrism could not make his way to Bishop Remigius, who officiated on this occasion. The interruption, however, was short; for a white dove descending from Heaven supplied the sacred oil, and, after the prince had been anointed and crowned, he was saluted as the newly arisen *Constantine.*

Pope Anastasius II. was overjoyed at this conversion, and entertained the hope that Clovis would prove the sincerity of his faith and the loyalty of his devotion by becoming the champion of the rights of the Church. He addressed a letter to the king, in which he said: "Complete the work thou hast begun, and become our consolation and our crown. Let thy conduct be so ordered that thy mother, the Church, who has borne thee to God, may rejoice in the undertakings and triumphs of so great a king. As thou art great and illustrious, be thou also the consolation of thy mother; be resolute and firm in her defense, and arm thyself with the helmet of salvation against the designs of the ungodly."

St. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, although a subject of Gundebald, also wrote to Clovis, congratulating him on his conversion to Christianity. "Be assured," he said, "most illustrious of princes, that the spotless robe of the humble neophyte will add fresh strength to the valor of thy arms, and that the deeds which by the aid of thy good fortune thou hast already achieved, will be eclipsed by the glory of those which thy piety will enable thee to perform. The world is filled with the fame of thy victories, and we, though of a foreign country, share in the glory of thy triumphs. When thou art victorious in battle, we feel that thy victories are ours as well."

---

[1] Mitis depone colla, Sicamber, adora quod incendisti, incende quod adorasti. (Tr.)

[2] *Hincmar* is the first who relates this legend. This oil of chrism, which was used at the coronation ceremony of the French kings, was, until the year 1793, preserved in a phial in the cathedral of Rheims.

The hopes entertained of this illustrious prince by Pope Anastasius and St. Avitus were fully realized. The lamp of Faith was lighted in France on Christmas night, and that festival has on this account always been specially dear to the French people. It is with them pre-eminently a family festival; and "*Noël*" has ever been the inspiring battle-cry of that gallant and chivalrous nation. From the days of Charles Martel to our own, the Church has never appealed in vain for aid to the power and sword of France. The bishops who had assembled in council at Orleans, A. D. 511, bestowed on Clovis the honorable title of "Eldest Son of the Church."[1] This prince did in fact attack and defeat the Burgundians and the Visigoths at Voulgé, near Poictiers (A. D. 507), and deprived them of nearly all their possessions in Gaul.

It is much to be regretted that the life of Clovis by no means corresponded to the earnest professions of his conversion, or to the sincere respect which he uniformly showed to the clergy. He left to his four sons a vast empire *stained with deeds of blood and murder.*

St. Gregory of Tours[2] assures us that dissension and debauchery were, for many years after the death of Clovis, familiar to the house of the Merovingians; and that bishops who had the courage to rebuke the royal libertines were sent into exile. These were frequently the ablest and most fearless defenders of the Church. A period of brighter promise was entered upon when *Dagobert I.*, after the death of his father and brothers, united all the provinces of the Frankish monarchy under one rule. Owing, however, to the want of energy and the worthlessness of the royal imbeciles who succeeded Dagobert, the monarchy was soon torn by internal dissensions and the country ravaged by the inroads of the Saracens. For a similar reason the government was wholly administered by the majores domus; and *Charles Martel*, who succeeded to that office on the death of his father, *Pepin of Heristal*, squandered the property of the Church upon lay abbots and soldiers. *Pepin* the *Short*, and his brother, *Carloman*, held the office conjointly until the latter withdrew into the monastery of Monte Cassino. Pepin secured the esteem of the nobles by the success of his wars in Saxony and Bavaria, and of the clergy by his co-operation with Archbishop Boniface in the efforts of the latter to reform the Church. Thus strong in the affections of both these classes, he summoned, with the consent of Pope *Zachary*, a general assembly of the empire to meet at Soissons, where he had Childeric III. deposed and himself anointed by Boniface king of the Franks, A. D. 752. The affairs of the Church now assumed a more hopeful aspect, and continued to improve under Charlemagne, the son and successor of Pepin.

---

[1] *Hincmari*, vita S. Remigii, c. 3 (*Hincm.* opp. T. I. Paris, 1645, fol., and *Surius*, vitae SS. ad d. 13. Januar.) Conf. *v. Murr*, The Holy Phial at Rheims, Nürnberg, 1801. *Alberd. Thijm*, les fils ainés de l'église (Revue Belge et étrangère, Brux. 1861).

[2] Conf. *Löbell*, Gregory of Tours and his Age, Lps. 1839. *Bornhack*, Hist. of the Franks under the Merovingians, Greifswalde, 1863, Pt. I. *Nädelin*, Merovingian Royalty, Stuttg. 1865.

§ 156. *Christianity in the British Isles.*

St. Patricii opusc. (max. bibl. T. VIII.; *Galland.* bibl. T. X., p. 159 sq.) ed. Waraeus., Lond. 1658. *Probi*, vita Patricii (*Bedae* Venerab. opp.) Conf. †*Greith*, Hist. of the Old Irish Church, Freiburg, 1867. *Gildae* Badonici (500–580) de excidio Britanniae lib. querulus, ed. Gale, Oxon. 1691. *Columbae* vita by Adamnan (*Canisii* lectt. antiq., T. I., p. 675–708, and by Cummineus; *Mabillon*, acta SS. ord. St. Bened., T. I.) *Beda Venerab.* h. e. Anglorum, ed. *Smith*, ed. *Giles*. See above, Vol. I., p. 40, note 1. *Usserii*, Britannicar. eccl. antiquitates (Dublin, 1639, 4to) London, 1687, fol. *Lingard*, Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Newcastle, 1806, 2 T., transl. into German, and ed. by *Ritter*, Breslau, 1847 (being a complete English Ch. H. down to the Restoration under Dunstan, in the tenth century). The *same*, Hist. of England, 10 vols. 1825. *Kemble*, The Saxons in England, transl. into German by *Brandes*, Lps. 1853, 2 vols. *Walter*, Ancient Wales, Bonn, 1859. *John Lanigan*, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, 2d ed., Dublin, 1829, 4 vols. †*Thomas Moore*, Hist. of Ireland, Paris, 1835, c. 9–13; German by *Klee*, Mentz, 1836. Hist. of Ireland, by *Cusack*, Nun of Kenmare, 1867. *Cotton*, Fasti eccl. Hibern., 5 vols., Dublin, 1845–1860 *Collier*, Political and Eccl. Hist. of Ireland. *Ebrard*, The Culdean Church of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, in *Niedner's* Journal of Hist. Theol. 1862 and 1863. The *same*, Ch. H. II. 393 sq. **Schwab*, Studies on Ch. H. by a Ref. Theol. (against Ebrard) Austr. Quart. for Theol. 1868, 1. †*Schrödl*, Introduction of

Christianity among the *Anglo-Saxons*, Passau, 1840. Cf. thereon, Tüb. Quart. 1840, p. 664 sq. **Montalembert*, The Monks of the West, Amer. ed. †*Zell*, Lioba and the pious Anglo-Saxon Women, Freibg. 1860. *Wasserschleben*, The Penitentiary Discipline of the Western Church, Halle, 1851 (that of Theodor of Canterbury, pp. 13–37, 145–219).

The traditions which assert that Christianity had been preached in Britain by either James the Elder, Simon the Zelot, or the apostle St. Peter, have long since been given up as untenable. The efforts of Anglican theologians in these latter days to establish the apostolic origin of their episcopacy, by attempting to prove that *St. Paul* was the founder of the Church in Britain,[1] have been entirely fruitless. It is certain, however, that Christianity was preached in the Island[2] at a very early date, and that many Britons suffered martyrdom, during the persecution of Diocletian,[3] rather than give up their faith.

It is also certain that Christianity had been preached in *Ireland* before *Palladius* reached its shores. Nor is it difficult to account for the fact. It is well known that an active commercial intercourse existed between Ireland and Gaul at this period, and that the ports of Ireland were more frequented than those of Britain by foreign merchants. Neither was it an unusual thing for the Irish of those days to make predatory descents upon the coast of Gaul, and to carry away captives many of the Christian inhabitants of that country. Either of these circumstances will satisfactorily account for the existence of Christianity in the island previously to the coming of Palladius. Pope Celestine, having been informed of the fact, consecrated Palladius, then a Roman deacon, and sent him into Ireland, in the year 431; and, as has been said, the latter on his arrival found many Christian communities[4] already existing in the island. Great hopes were entertained of this mission;[1] but, as Palladius was entirely ignorant of the country, and lacking in the courage and perseverance so necessary to the success of great enterprises, they were never realized. To undertake so arduous a mission with any reasonable hope of ultimately achieving success required a special training and a thorough knowledge of the people, such as by extraordinary circumstances were placed within the reach of *St. Patrick*, the true *apostle of Ireland*. *St. Patrick* (*Patricius*) was born A. D. 387, according to his own account, at Bonavem Taverniae; that is, at *Boulogne*, on the coast of Picardy,[2] then called Armorica. His father, Calpurnius, was a deacon; his grandfather, Potitus, a priest; and his mother, Conchessa, is said to have been a near relative of St. Martin of Tours. At the age of sixteen he was carried away captive to Ireland by some Irish pirates who had made a descent upon the coast of Gaul. Having arrived in Ireland, he was sold into slavery, and set to tend flocks of sheep and herds of cattle. Here abandoned by all, and left to his own thoughts, he felt the want and experienced the power and sweetness of prayer. At the end of six years, a voice from Heaven commanded him to make his way to a certain port, where he would find a vessel in readiness to carry him to his own country.

---

[1] Traditions of the Ancient British church, *Bonn Periodical*, n. 15, p. 88 sq., and *New Series*, 3d year, nro. 3, p. 174 sq.

[2] Vol. I., p. 252.

[3] *Beda Venerab.* h. e. I. 4. Conf. c. 17 and 21. *Lingard*, Hist. of Engl. German by *Salis*, Vol. I., ch. 1.

[4] "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatus a Papa Caelestino Palladius primus episcopus mittitur." Prosperi Chron. ad annum 431.

After his arrival in Gaul, he went to Tours, where he spent four years at the school of St. Martin, laying up those stores of knowledge, and sinking deep and wide that foundation of virtue, of which in after years he stood in so much need. From Tours he went to spend a short time with his parents, and, while at his father's house, had a dream in which he beheld the Irish people calling out to him, from beyond the sea, to come and pass the remainder of his days in their midst.

---

[1] "Ordinato Scotis episcopo, dum Romanam insulam (Britanniam) studet servare Catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram Christianam."

[2] Not at *Kilpatrick*, in Northumberland, Britain, as it has been generally supposed since the time of *Usher*. *Bonavem*, in the Celtic language, is the Latin *Bononia*, and the adjunct *Taverniae* designates the *regio Tarbannensis* (Tarabanna, or Tarvenna, the same as Terouanne), where Bononia was situated. See *Lanigan*, 1, 93. If St. Patrick is frequently called a Briton (Britannus), we are not to suppose that it is intended to signify that he was a native of the British island, for the inhabitants of the country round Boulogne were called Britanni as early as the days of Pliny. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 20.

This he interpreted as a call from God, but did not immediately answer it. In the year 418, he paid a visit to *St. Germanus*, who had been lately consecrated bishop of Auxerre, by whose advice he went, probably to the famous school of the Island of Lerins, to further perfect himself in knowledge and virtue. Leaving this cloister, he returned to St. Germanus, who probably still continued to be his master in the spiritual life, and at his recommendation visited Rome, in the year 431, in the company of a priest, whom the bishop sent with him to bear witness to his great excellence.[1] Here he received a commission to preach the Gospel to the Irish people, and, with Pope Celestine's benediction upon him, set out for his distant mission. On his way through Gaul, he heard of the death of Palladius, and was consecrated in his stead by Amator, Bishop of Evreux (*Ebroicum*). He set sail from the shores of Gaul with a few companions, among whom Auxilius and Isserinus appear to have been the most conspicuous, and landed in Ireland, A. D. 432.

The inhabitants of the island, when St. Patrick landed on its shores, were given to the worship of stars, and adored fountains. It does not seem that the use of idols was general among them; and if they sometimes represented their gods under material forms, these were no more than blocks of stone rudely sculptured into figures. Mountains and hills were the sanctuaries of their gods, and here they met for purposes of worship.

The inhabitants of the country were divided into two *distinct* classes, one of which embraced the aborigines, who, as the ancient traditions of the country state, were *Milesians*, and had come from Gallicia (Iberia); the other embraced the Scots (Scythae?), who had more recently come into the country, had subdued the old possessors of the soil, and now held them in subjection.[1]

---

[1] The journey of St. Patrick to Rome is mentioned not only by *Probus* and other biographers, but also by *Hericus*, Vita S. Germ. I. 12 (in Actis SS. Julii, T. VII.) Hericus, however, wrote about the year 860. But as the Book of Armagh, and the Life of St. Patrick, contained therein, were written by the Blessed *Aidan*, of Sletty, who died in 698, we have an authority for his journey in the seventh century. The silence of the *Confession*, in which St. Patrick relates only those circumstances in which he beheld an especial Divine Providence, can not be adduced as an authority against this journey. Döllinger, l. l. p. 21.

Easter Sunday is a memorable day in the history of Ireland. It was forbidden to light a fire on Easter Saturday until after the flames of that lighted in honor of Baal, the sun god,[2] should have appeared from the hill of Tara. St. Patrick, disregarding the injunction, lighted the Easter-fire on Saturday, and King Laeghairé (Leogaire), indignant at this bold violation of a religious custom, went out in person, accompanied by his Druids, to learn who the strangers were, and what was their mission. A discussion was arranged between St. Patrick and the Druids, to take place on the following day, at Tara. That morning, St. Patrick and his companions set out on their way, chanting hymns as they went along. Arrived at Tara, our Saint explained the faith of Christ with the eloquence, earnestness, and simplicity characteristic of apostolic men. His words were listened to with respect and attention, and so potent was their influence that *Dubtach*, the chief poet and Druid of the king, was converted. Conall Creevan, a brother of the king, was among the first disciples of Patrick. Patrick also conciliated the good-will and effected the conversion of many young men of the higher classes, who subsequently shared his apostolic labors. Many young maidens, also, led captive by the chaste beauty of the doctrine St. Patrick preached, dedicated their virginity to God, and embraced an ascetic life. They were frequently opposed in their good purposes by their parents, but the only effect of such opposition was to strengthen their resolution and add to their numbers.[3] St. Patrick went to Connaught, where he remained seven years. During his stay in this province his labors were blessed by the most remarkable and numerous conversion of his missionary life. As he was approaching the land of *Tirawley*, he learned that a great multitude were assembled to celebrate a festival in honor of the seven sons of King Amalgaidh, who had lately died. Advancing into the midst of the assembled clan, he preached the doctrine of Christ, and laid open its truths with such force and lucidity that seven princes and twelve thousand of the people[1] received the faith and were baptized by Patrick at the fountain of Enardhae.

---

[1] St. Patrick calls the great body of the original natives *Hiberionaces*, for Ireland in his writings is named *Hiberione*. Not only numbers of these, but many also of the ruling class, had, he says, in his *Confessions*, become Christians. *Döllinger*, l. l., p. 22.

[2] See Life of St. Patrick, by *M. F. Cusack*, p. 253 et seq. (Tr.)

[3] Filii Scotorum et filiae regulorum monachi et virgines Christi esse videntur. In the letter against Coroticus, written before the Confessions, these Scots are spoken of as persecutors of the Christians. It was not until about eighty or ninety years from this period that the appellation of "*Scots*" was given in common to all the Irish, and that the island was known by the name of "Scotia."

After the year 439, Secundinus, Auxilius, and Isserinus, whom St. Patrick had sent to either Britain or Gaul to receive episcopal consecration, shared his missionary labors.

In the year 455, toward the end of his life, St. Patrick received from a wealthy chief by the name of Daire[2] a tract of land, for the erection of a cathedral, on a hill in the neighborhood of the residence of the kings of Ulster. The district itself was called *Macha*, and around the cathedral a town rapidly sprang up, known as *Ard-Macha*, the present Armagh, which became the ecclesiastical metropolis of Ireland.

Years before (A. D. 432–3) Patrick had founded the monastery of *Saul* on a tract of land which had been given to him by Dichu, and between this famous retreat and the see of Armagh he spent the remaining days of his laborious life. After he had once set foot in Ireland as a missionary, he never again thought of returning to his native land. To one so earnest in the performance of his duties, and so sensitive of the responsibility which rested upon him, such thoughts would have been associated with a dread of disobeying the will of Christ, who had set him over the Irish Church, and commanded him to remain with the Irish people all the days of his life.[3]

The present Scotland was not so called before the eleventh century. *Döllinger*, in l. c., p. 23.

[1] Life of St. Patrick, by Miss *Cusack*, p. 296 et seq. *Userii* Antiquitates, ed. Dublin, p. 865. (Tr.)

[2] Book of Armagh, fol. 6, b. a.

[3] Confessions, p. 17.

Shortly after the erection of the cathedral of Armagh, Patrick, together with Auxilius and Isserinus, held a synod, in which many useful statutes were enacted for the government and direction of the infant Church.

To show the sentiments entertained by St. Patrick and the early Irish Church toward the Holy See, it will be sufficient to quote one of the *Canons of St. Patrick*, which even Usher, who has translated them, admits to be genuine: "Whenever any cause that is very difficult, and unknown to all the judges of the Scottish nation, shall arise, it is rightly to be referred to the see of the archbishop of the Irish (that is, of Patrick), and to the examination of the prelate thereof. But if there, by him and his wise men, a cause of this nature can not easily be made up, we have decreed it shall be sent to the See Apostolic—that is, to the chair of the Apostle Peter—which hath the authority of the city of Rome."[1]

The only letter extant written by St. Patrick is the well-known one against *Coroticus*, a British chief, who had made a descent upon the Irish coast, and carried away captive many Christians baptized by the Saint himself. This act very naturally caused him great pain, and he wrote in consequence a circular letter, containing a sentence of excommunication against Coroticus, which he ordered all the priests to read to their people, even in the presence of the chief.

Our Saint, conscious that his life and labors were now drawing to a close, withdrew to the monastery of Saul, where he probably wrote his *Confessions*. In these he tells us that he had visited every corner of the island, and had everywhere ordained priests, and that the great bulk of the people were Christians.

At this monastery, the first of his founding, the retreat he loved so well, and into which he was accustomed to retire, when worn with the fatigues of missionary labor, to spend a few days alone with his God, St. Patrick breathed his last, March 17, A. D. 465.

He was succeeded in the See of Armagh by *Benignus*, whose father, *Seschnan*, had kept St. Patrick over night when this latter was on his way to Tara, and who, as a reward for his hospitality, obtained for himself and his whole family the grace of faith.[1]

---

[1] History of Ireland, by Miss *Cusack*, p. 79. (Tr.)

The effects of St. Patrick's zeal and prudence were soon visible. Cloister-schools, under the direction of the bishops, were soon to be found in great numbers all over the island, and rapidly grew into famous seats of learning. Toward the close of the fifth century, St. Bridget introduced into Ireland a rule for nuns, and founded many convents throughout the country, the most famous of which was that of Kildare (A. D. 490). There can be no better evidence of the energy, prudence, and zeal of St. Patrick, and those who took up his work after him, and of the docility, earnestness, and generosity of the Irish people, than the fact, that, in the course of the sixth century, the Gospel had spread from one end of the island to the other, from hamlet to city, and from palace to cottage. *Muchertach*, the chief king, who reigned from 513 to 533, openly professed Christianity, and multitudes of men, of all classes and of every age, forsook the world to follow Christ. The face of the whole island was changed. A nation that but a few short years before had been shrouded in the darkness of paganism, was suddenly illumined by the pure rays of Divine truth. Churches and chapels, monasteries and convents, schools and colleges, covered the land, and from hill and valley one song of thanksgiving went up to the throne of God. And thus Erin became the *Island of Saints*,[2] the home and refuge of learning and holiness, and the nursery whence missionaries went forth to carry the light of faith to the nations of the European continent. Her seats of learning, her monasteries and nunneries, and her charitable institutions were unsurpassed, either in number or excellence, by those of any nation of the world. Her children preserved the faith of Christ as pure and entire as it came from the lips of her apostle; heresy and schism were unknown to them; and loyalty to the successor of St. Peter was one of their most distinguishing characteristics.[1] They have remained faithful and attached to the Supreme Head of the Church, with unvarying uniformity, amid every vicissitude of fortune, from the days of St. Patrick to our own; and there is every indication that their fidelity to the Vicar of Christ will be as unbroken and cordial in the future as it has been in the past.

---

[1] *Bolland.* Acta Sanctorum, mensis Martii, Tom. II., p. 517; mensis Feb. Tom. III., pp. 131, 179.

[2] The Anglican bishop, *Usher*, who died 1665, found and published a most remarkable *Catalogue* of *Irish Saints*, which was compiled, probably, about the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. In it, the Irish saints are ranged in three classes, according to the ages in which they lived. The *first* class is of those who lived from the coming of *St. Patrick*, 432, to the year 542, and to it belong three hundred and fifty bishops (mostly *chorepiscopi*, or *country*-bishops) and founders of churches, "for all the Irish bishops were then holy, and filled with the spirit of God." Of the *second* class of saints, which comprehends those who lived from 542 to 598, and which comprises three hundred persons, the smaller number is of bishops, the greater of priests, probably abbots and monks, as during this epoch the monasteries of Ireland flourished in all their splendor. The *third* class of saints consists of priests and of a few bishops, in number about one hundred persons. They lived from

The northern portion of the country now known as *Scotland* (Caledonia) was inhabited at this period by the *Caledonians*, like the Irish, either a Gallic or Celtic tribe; the southern portion, or that which lies between the Frith of Forth and the Grampian Hills, by the *Picts*, who had come from Scandinavia.

Bishop Ninian, a native of Britain, who had been educated in Rome, converted the Picts to Christianity in the year 412. The Caledonians, or, as they are sometimes called, the Northern Picts, were converted by *St. Columba*, or Columbkill,[2] who commenced his missionary life among them about one hundred and fifty years later.

This remarkable man, who belonged to the royal houses of

---

605 to 665. See *Userii* Britan. eccles. antiquitates, p. 913 sq. Conf. Döllinger, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 188–191; Engl. transl., Vol. II., p. 32–34.

[1] St. Columbanus thus describes the Irish Church in his Epistle to Pope Boniface IV., in 613 (Biblioth. PP. Max. XII. 28). In like manner speaks Cummian, a countryman and contemporary of St. Columbanus (*Usserii* Vet. Epist. Hib. Sylloge, Paris, 1669).

[2] St. Columba, like many of the Irish saints, borrowed from the Latin a symbolical name, signifying *Dove of the Holy Ghost*, a title which he merited by the remarkable purity of his life. He is also called Columb-Kill, or Cille—that is, *Dove of the Cell;* and is sometimes confounded with his countryman Columbanus, the celebrated founder of Luxeuil. His name originally was *Crimthan*. *Beda*, Eccl. Hist., V. 10. *Montalembert*, Monks of the West, Bk. IX., chap. I. (Tr.)

Ireland, was born at *Gartan*, in the county of Donegal, December 7, A. D. 521, and was educated in the famous school of *St. Finnian* of Maghbile, who had himself studied at Rome. Before Columba had reached his twenty-fifth year, he had founded a great number of monasteries in Ireland, the most celebrated of which was that of *Derry*, in his own native province, which was long the seat of a great Catholic bishopric, and is now known under the modern name of *Londonderry*.[1] He had received deacon's orders from St. Finnian, and in the year 550 was raised to the priesthood, but his humility was such that he would never consent to take upon him the episcopal office and dignity.

In the year 563, when in the forty-second year of his age, Columba set out from his native land, accompanied by twelve companions, and, in one of those large osier boats, covered with hide, which the Celtic nations used for purposes of navigation, sailed to the north, and landed on the shores of the island of Iona, or Hy, to which, in memory of the Saint, the name of Hy-Columbkill was afterward given. He and his companions immediately set about building a monastery, which was of the rudest description, consisting only of a frame covered with the interlaced branches of trees. It was not till some years later that a more substantial edifice was erected, with much danger and labor, as the large oaks to be used in its construction were brought across the waters from the neighboring shores. Such was the humble beginning of the great monastic center whence issued those devoted heroes who carried the blessings of religion and civilization to Scotland and Great Britain. New communities went forth from the mother house of Iona, and established themselves among the Northern and Southern Picts, and even in our day the remains of fifty-three churches, to which, according to the custom of that age, monasteries were attached, have been discovered in both those districts, all dating back to the time of St. Columba.[2]

God deigned to give the Divine sanction to the mission of this great saint by granting him the grace of miracles.

---

[1] Ibid., Vol. II., pp. 9 et seq. (Tr.)

[2] Monks of the West, Vol. II., Book IX., chap. III. (Tr.)

Purity of life and humility were his two distinguishing virtues.

In the year 590, Columba returned to Ireland, and, while there, assisted at the national assembly, or parliament, held at Drumceitt, or Drumkeath, in which King Aedh proposed the abolition of the order of bards. These were at once the historians, genealogists, poets, and musicians of Ireland. They preserved in verse and rich poetic imagery the traditions of the past, and celebrated the triumphs and glories of the chiefs in whose age they lived. The graceful charm which they threw about the legendary history of Erin, and the stirring notes in which they sang her victories in war, invested them with a sacred character in the eyes of the lower classes, and made them all-powerful and highly respected with the nobles. They, however, sometimes abused both their influence and their gift, exciting the violent hatred of some by the satire of their verse, and of others by the insolence of their behavior.

When Columba visited Ireland, King Aedh had resolved to banish, or, as others say, to put to the sword, this obnoxious class of men, but the former pleaded so eloquently and so persistently in their favor that they were let off with a restriction of their former privileges.[1]

Columba, in virtue of his privileges as founder of the Church in both Northern and Southern Scotland, exercised ecclesiastic jurisdiction throughout both of these countries, and, out of respect to his memory, this prerogative was conceded to many of his successors, though these were only priests.[2] This jurisdiction was not, however, exercised by them as priests, but as abbots or generals of their order.[3]

This distinguished apostle of Great Britain, after a long and laborious life, died as he had lived. After going over all the island and taking a tender farewell of the monks at work in the fields, and praying in the cloisters, he withdrew to his own cell, and, when the bell rang at midnight for matins, rose and preceded his brethren to the church. Here he was found, by his faithful children, prostrate before the altar, and in a dying condition. Raising his right hand, he blessed the community and expired, June 9, 597.[1]

---

[1] Monks of the West, l. c. (Tr.)

[2] "Habere autem solet ipsa insula (Hy) rectorem semper abbatem presbyterum cujus juri et *omnis provincia* et ipsi etiam episcopi, ordine inusitato, debeant esse subjecti, juxta exemplum primi doctoris illius (Columbae) qui non episcopus, sed presbyter extitit et monachus. *Bede*, Hist. Eccl. III. 4.

[3] "In quibus omnibus idem monasterium Insulanum (Hy) in quo ipse (St. Columba) requiescit corpore principatum tenet." *Bede*, h. e. III. 4.

In the fourth century, the bulk of the inhabitants of Britain had already been converted to Christianity. But the Britons, no longer protected by the power of Rome, and unable to defend themselves against the Picts and Scots, who seized every opportunity to make incursions into their country, sought aid elsewhere. It happened that, at this time, a Saxon squadron was cruising in the British channel, in quest of adventure, under the command of the two brothers, Hengist and Horsa. Vortigern, the most important of the petty kings who held sway in the island, invited the strangers to enter into an alliance with him, and to trust to his generosity for their reward (A. D. 449). Having obtained a footing, the Saxons conducted themselves as conquerors rather than allies, driving the Christians into the remote western parts of the island, and destroying their churches. To add to the misfortune of these persecuted Christians, their clergy had become so degenerate as to be incapable either of inspiring them with sentiments of patriotic devotion and brave resistance, or of soothing the pain of their humiliation by the consolations of religion.[2] Oppression produced its usual effects upon them.

---

[1] Monks of the West, l. c.

[2] The Epist. *Gildae Sapientis*, who wrote in the beginning of the sixth century, contains a very severe account of the degenerate condition of both the clergy and laity of this period. (In *Gale*, Scriptores Historiae Britann., Oxon. 1691, fol. Tom. I. et Max. Biblioth. Tom. VIII., p. 715. *Galland.* Tom. XII., p. 189.)

Melancholy is the contrast, says *Döllinger*, with the flourishing condition of the Irish Church, that is presented to us by the state of decay and oppression in which, at this period, we find the Church of Britain. The devout Gildas has left to us a strongly colored picture of the degeneracy and corruption of the people, and of the disgraceful lives of the clergy in the first half of the sixth century. . . . Severe, but not unmerited, was the judgment that was inflicted upon the Britons and their Church, etc. Ch. Hist. Eng. transl., Vol. II., pp. 35, 36. Still, Abbé *Darras* (Vol. II., p. 104) applies the title of *Isle of Saints* to England as well as to Ireland during this age, and speaks of "the glorious name bequeathed to England by the Christians of the *sixth* century." (Tr.)

Deprived by their conquerors of the civilizing influences of Christian institutions, and entertaining a deep and vindictive spirit of hatred against their treacherous allies, they so far lost the spirit of the Gospel that they never showed the slightest disposition to make a pacific and glorious conquest of their oppressors by converting them to the religion of Christ.

The conquerors of Britain, after having driven the ancient inhabitants of the island into the wild mountains of the west, formed themselves into a heptarchy, or seven independent kingdoms of unequal extent and influence, under the general direction of a *Bretwalda*, or chief king, who exercised a sort of suzerainty over all. His authority, however, was nominal rather than real, and the petty kingdoms were not, as the name *heptarchy* implies, always of uniform number. Almost every trace of Christianity disappeared from those portions of the country occupied by the Anglo-Saxons, and a rude idolatry, possessing none of the graceful features or comparative purity which characterized the worship of the ancient Celts, was substituted in its stead. The petty kings, having no longer anything to fear from the enmity of the Britons, and possessing no bond of union other than that derived from common interests and the instinct of self-preservation, began now to make war upon each other. It is difficult to say what might have been the condition of Britain had not a fortunate circumstance, which occurred at this time, brought the idolatrous inhabitants of that country under the notice of a man whose true Catholic heart embraced all nations in its wide charity, and who finally succeeded in bringing the Anglo-Saxons under the sweet yoke of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

This was *Gregory the Great*, who, while yet a monk, as he was one day passing through the forum at Rome, was struck by the fair complexion and radiant beauty of some Anglo-Saxon youths there exposed for sale, and learning that they and their people were idolaters, grieved that the souls of persons so handsome without should be disfigured by so much deformity within.[1] He at once conceived the desire of going himself as a missionary into their country to announce the Gospel of Jesus Christ to those poor people; but the Romans, who greatly esteemed him for his many virtues, would not hear of his departure from their midst. But, though not permitted himself to undertake so arduous and glorious a mission, the project was always dear to his heart, and he resolved, if God should ever give him the means, to carry it into execution. Having been elevated to the dignity of Supreme Pontiff, he purchased some of those fair Saxon slaves, placed them in monastic schools, and had them educated in the doctrines of the Christian religion. But the great Pope did not rest here. In the year 595, he resolved to send missionaries into Britain, and selected for the leader of this difficult mission the monk *Augustine*, then abbot of the monastery at Rome which now bears the name of St. Gregory,[2] and is situated on the western angle of Mount Coelius. From this monastery, around which cluster so many beautiful and touching traditions, Augustine set forth on his distant mission, accompanied by forty monks of his own community.[1] On their way they visited the island of Lerins, and, while there, learned that it was next to impossible to acquire a knowledge of the language of the Anglo-Saxons; that the people themselves were barbarous and ferocious; that it would be hopeless to attempt their conversion to the mild and humane law of the Gospel, and that those who should be foolhardy enough to persist in so wild a dream would expose themselves to certain destruction. Frightened by these reports, the companions of Augustine persuaded him to return to Rome and represent to Pope Gregory the perils and use-

---

[1] "What evil luck," said Gregory, "that the Prince of Darkness should possess beings with aspect so radiant, and that the grace of these countenances should

---

reflect a soul void of inward grace! But what nation are they of?" "They are Angles." "They are well named, for these Angles have the faces of angels, and they must become the brethren of angels in heaven. From what province have they been brought?" "From Deira" (one of the two kingdoms of Northumbria). "Still good," answered he. "De ira eruti—they shall be snatched from the anger of God to the mercy of Christ. And how name they the king of their country?" "Alle or Ælla." "So be it; he is right well named, for they shall soon sing Alleluia in his kingdom." Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 145. (Tr.)

[1] Not fourteen, as stated in *Döllinger's* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 39. Cf. *Palma*, Praelectiones H. E., Vol. II., p. 423. (Tr.)

[2] Now the titular church of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Henry Ed. Manning.

lessness of such a journey. The Pope, however, would not hear of the undertaking being abandoned, told Augustine it were better not to have entered upon the work at all than give it up, once it had been commenced; and, giving him and his mission the apostolic blessing, again sent him "forward in God's name." The Pope also gave Augustine letters to the Abbot of Lerins, to the Bishop of Aix, and to the governors of provinces, thanking them for their past services to the missionaries; and to the bishops of Tours, Vienne, and Autun, and to Virgilius, metropolitan of Arles, recommending Augustine and his companions to their kind offices. He also wrote to the two young kings of Austrasia and Burgundy, and to their mother, Brunehaut, who reigned in their name over Eastern France, explaining the object of the mission, and begging that they would send interpreters to accompany the missionaries to Britain, and provide a royal safe-conduct to insure their safety while journeying through Gaul.

Thus protected, Augustine and his comrades crossed Frankish Gaul, and after a short voyage landed, in the year 597, on the *Isle* of *Thanet*, where, a century and a half before, the two brothers, Hengist and Horsa, first touched the British shores, and where, nearly six centuries and a half before, the terrible legions of Caesar disembarked to reduce this distant island to a province of the Roman Empire.

Ethelbert—that is, the *noble* and *valiant*—the reigning king of Kent, who had been recognized *Bretwalda*, or chief-king, by the other princes of the heptarchy, had married *Bertha*, the daughter of *Caribert*, king of the Franks of Paris. This princess, being a Christian, had been affianced to Ethelbert only on condition that she should be permitted to observe the practices of her religion. She brought with her as spiritual adviser, from her native country, *Luidhard*, a Christian bishop, who practiced the offices of his religion in an old Catholic church of the Roman times, situated near Canterbury, which had escaped destruction at the hands of the Barbarians. King Ethelbert, having taken a few days to deliberate on the course to be pursued with regard to the missionaries, paid them a visit on the island where they had landed, and, having seated himself on an oak stump, listened to their address, and learned their intentions, informed them, that, as they were strangers to him, he could not at once give up the belief of his fathers and of his nation, but assured them that, since they evidently believed what they said, they should be hospitably entertained, and might go through his kingdom, preaching and converting whom they could.[1]

He also gave them the old Roman church[2] at *Dorovernum* (Canterbury = Kent-war-bury, that is, the borough of the men of Kent). This church was dedicated to St. Martin, and thither Augustine and his monks repaired to celebrate Mass, chant the divine office, and perform other offices of the ministry.

King Ethelbert, charmed by the holiness of their lives, and won by the purity of their doctrine, asked and obtained permission to enter the church, and was baptized by St. Augustine on the Feast of Pentecost, A. D. 597.

The example of the king had a very salutary effect upon his countrymen, and on the following *Christmas*, A. D. 597, ten thousand of them were received into the Church. They were baptized in the Thames, at the mouth of the Medway, opposite the Isle of Sheppey.[3] Pope Gregory, in writing to Augustine, to Eulogius (Patriarch of Alexandria), and to Bertha (Ethelbert's queen), expressed the great joy which these events gave him. In the meantime, Augustine had, by order of the Pope, gone to Gaul, where he was consecrated Archbishop of the Anglo-Saxons by Virgilius, the former Abbot of Lerins and now Metropolitan of Arles, on the same day on which the ten thousand were baptized in the Thames.

Gregory, on receiving the glad tidings of these successes in Britain, immediately sent out a fresh colony of monks, who carried with them relics, vestments, sacred vessels, altar furniture, and a stock of books destined to form the beginning of an ecclesiastical library.[1] Of these, the most conspicuous were *Mellitus* and *Justus*, who succeeded each other, on the death of Lawrence, in the metropolitan see of Canterbury, and *Paulinus*, the apostle of Northumbria. The Pope also authorized Augustine to establish twelve episcopal sees in Southern Britain; and gave him permission to appoint whom he would metropolitan of the ancient Roman city of *York* (Eboracum), as soon as the faith should have spread to Northern Britain. This see was also to have twelve suffragan bishops, all of whom, with the metropolitan of York, were to be subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury during the lifetime of Augustine.[2]

---

[1] Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 154. (Tr.)

[2] The present Church," says Count *Montalembert* (Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 155), "rebuilt in the thirteenth century, occupies the place of that which is forever consecrated by the double memory of Bertha and Augustine, the Archbishop. The baptismal fonts are shown there, in which, according to tradition, King Ethelbert was baptized by immersion." (Tr.)

[3] *Palma*, Praelectiones H. E., Vol. I., p. 423. *St. Greg.* Epist. VIII. 30. Dean *Stanley's* Memorials of Canterbury, p. 19. (Tr.)

The instructions of Gregory with regard to the disposition to be made of Pagan temples are marked by that prudent moderation which always distinguished him. He gave orders that these should not be demolished, but that, as soon as the inhabitants of those districts in which they were situated, should have embraced Christianity, they should be cleansed with holy water, and altars, containing the relics of saints, constructed and placed in them, that they might thus be converted into sanctuaries of the true God.

It was customary with the Anglo-Saxons to commence their worship and their sports with plentiful feasts, and while it was thought prudent that these should not be abolished, it was at the same time deemed absolutely necessary that their meaning and import should be changed, and that, instead of a Pagan, they should bear a Christian significance. In order to this, they were appointed to take place on such festivals of the Church as would be at once occasions of rejoicing, and memorials of events distinctively Christian. Such were the festivals of Church-dedication, and the annual commemoration of martyrs whose bones reposed under the altars of the various churches throughout the country.[3]

---

[1] "Nec non et codices plurimos." *Bede*, I. 29. An old catalogue of the first consignment of books ends with these words: "This is the origin of the library of the whole English Church," A. D. 601. Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 164. (Tr.)

[2] Epist. 65, tit. 11, ad Augustinum. (Tr.)

[3] St. Augustine had sent a messenger to Rome to confer with the Pope on

St. Augustine went to his eternal reward, May 12, A. D. 605, just two months after the death of Pope Gregory the Great, by whom he had been sent into England. Previously to his death, Augustine had chosen *Lawrence*, one of his companions, to succeed him in the primatial see of Canterbury, and had had him consecrated for that office, thus wisely providing for any possible contingency in the infant church of Britain. The choice did great honor to Augustine, for Lawrence was equally distinguished by unremitting zeal in missionary labor and spotless integrity of life.

If little or no difficulty had been experienced in bringing the Chief-King, or Bretwalda, to embrace Christianity, it was quite otherwise with the remaining princes of the heptarchy, with perhaps one exception. This was *Saberet*, a nephew of Ethelbert, and king of the neighboring kingdom of Essex. He received the monks with kindness, and was himself baptized by Mellitus, one of the new missionaries sent by Gregory, and who became bishop of London, A. D. 604. This, the chief city of the East Saxons, was at that early day a flourishing and populous place. King Ethelbert built for Mellitus the cathedral of St. Paul, and authorized the erection of a second bishopric in his own kingdom of Kent, at the Roman city of Rochester, twenty miles west of Canter-

---

these important matters, and the instructions received by him are given in *Greg. M.* Epistolar., lib. XI., nros. 28 sq. opp. ed. Benedict., T. II., p. 110 sq.; in *Beda Venerab.* opp. l. c.; and at length in the letter to *Mellitus*, Bishop of London, opp. T. II., p. 1175. Cf. also note *b* of the Benedictine edition: "Dicite et (Augustino) quid diu mecum de causa Anglorum cogitans tractavi: videlicet quia fana idolorum destrui in eadem gente minime debeant; sed ipsa, quae in eis sunt idola, destruantur; aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspergatur, altaria construantur, reliquiae ponantur; quia si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est, ut a cultu daemonum in obsequium veri Dei debeant mutari." Cf. also lib. XI., ep. 64: "Placet mihi, ut sive in Romana ecclesia sive in Gallicarum sive in qualibet ecclesia aliquid invenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas et in Anglorum ecclesia, quae adhuc in fide nova est, institutione praecipua, quae de multis ecclesiis colligere potueris, infundas.—Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et quae quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem depone."

bury, over which *Justus*, another of the new missionaries, was set.[1]

In the year 616, both Ethelbert and Saberet died, and the prospects for the further advancement of religion in the kingdoms over which they had ruled were anything but promising. *Eadbald*, the son of Ethelbert, was captivated by the beauty of the lady whom his father had married on the death of Bertha, and, when he succeeded to the throne, took her to his bed, and forsook a religion which would not permit him the gratification of his passions.[2] His example had a most mischievous influence upon his subjects. It kept those out of the Church who otherwise would have entered her communion, and caused the relapse of others who were either tired of the restraints of Christianity, or desired to stand well with their king. The Church in England was threatened with still greater misfortunes when Saberet, the founder of Westminster Abbey, and nephew of Ethelbert, died, and his three sons, who had continued Pagans and enemies to Christianity, came to the throne of Essex. They openly professed Paganism, and gave permission to their subjects to worship idols. Being present on one occasion, when Mellitus was administering Holy Communion, they demanded of the bishop that he should also give them of that "white bread" which he had given to their father. The bishop promptly refused, unless they, like their father, should consent to be cleansed in the waters of baptism. The princes, indignant at this refusal, ordered him to quit their kingdom. The Bishop of London withdrew into the kingdom of Kent to confer with Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Justus, Bishop of Rochester, as to the course to be pursued in the face of these growing difficulties, and the three agreed to return home, where they might serve God, as they thought, more effectually. Mellitus and Justus had already crossed over to France, and Lawrence was about to follow them, but the night before his intended departure he slept in the church of the monastery where reposed the remains of Augustine, Ethelbert, and Bertha, and during the night had a dream, in which St. Peter appeared to him, chided him for his cowardice, and scourged him till the blood came, for thinking of leaving a church over which he had been set as bishop, and for which he should rather die, than abandon it to the enemies of Christ. The next day the archbishop hastened to the king, who at once demanded who had dared treat one such as he so ill. "It was St. Peter," replied Lawrence, "who inflicted on me these blows and sufferings for your salvation."[1]

---

[1] Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 182. *Lingard's* Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 24. (Baltimore, 1854.) (Tr.)

[2] *Lingard*, l. c. p. 24. (Tr.)

Eadbald, terrified by so signal a chastisement, renounced idolatry, put away his father's wife, received baptism, and recalled Mellitus and Justus from France.

Eadbald, though sufficiently powerful to restore Christianity within the limits of his own kingdom, was not, like his father, invested with the authority of Bretwalda, and could not therefore command obedience from the people of Essex. These, and particularly the inhabitants of London, obstinately refused to again receive Mellitus and the other Christian missionaries, saying that they much preferred their own idolatrous priests.[2] Mellitus, on the death of Lawrence, A. D. 619, succeeded him in the see of Canterbury. The kingdom of Essex seemed now almost hopelessly lost to Christianity, and the same may be said of East Anglia. Redwald, the king of the latter country, had been converted while on a visit to Ethelbert, but after his return home, had, through the influence of his wife and counselors, relapsed into Paganism.

The missionaries, however, met with considerable success in the kingdom of *Northumbria*, and, through the influence which this conquest gave them, were enabled to bring back and permanently secure to the Church the kingdoms of Essex and East Anglia.

The conversion of the kingdom of Northumbria can not be overestimated in its influence upon the spread of Christianity in England. It was the largest and most important kingdom of the heptarchy, was intimately connected with the kingdom of East Anglia, and its king, at the date of its conversion, exercised the authority of Bretwalda.

---

[1] *Bede*, II. 6. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, II. 6, 7. (Tr.)

King Edwin, who was mainly instrumental in introducing Christianity among the Angles to the north of the Humber, was the son of *Ella*, or *Alla*, the first king of the *Deïrians*, who then occupied the extensive region now known as Yorkshire, and had been excluded from the throne by *Ethelfrid* the *Ravager*, the son of *Ida*, called by the British bards, on account of his cruelty, the *Man of Fire*, or the *Great Burner*. Ethelfrid united under his own standard all the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria, who had heretofore composed the two kingdoms of *Bernicia* and *Deïra*. Edwin grew up at the court of *Redwald*, the king of East Anglia, and had married the daughter of his protector. Ethelfrid, fearing that the young prince whose crown he had usurped might become a dangerous rival, employed every means to induce Redwald, who was then Bretwalda, to deliver him into his hands. Redwald was about to comply with the request, when his wife interposed, and besought her lord not to violate, for gold, his honor and the sacred rights of hospitality.[1] Redwald, who had formerly renounced Christianity, in compliance with the wish of his wife, now listened to her prudent counsel, and, instead of betraying the young prince, declared war against Ethelfrid, and defeated and slew him in battle. Edwin now became king of Northumbria, and, on the death of Redwald, assumed the title and authority of *Bretwalda*, which, from this time forward, remained attached to the kingdom of Northumbria. Having lost his first wife, he sought in marriage *Ethelburga* (noble protectress), the sister of the reigning king of Kent, and daughter of Ethelbert and Bertha. She was therefore descended from Kengirt, on her father's side, and on her mother's, from Saint Clotilda. Her brother, Eadbald, at first refused to listen to the proposals of the Northumbrian king, because the latter was a pagan. Edwin assured him that the princess, in case she became his wife, should be at liberty to observe all the practices and rites of her religion; that the same privilege should be extended to any number of persons, of whatever quality or condition, she might see fit to bring with her; and that it was not improbable he himself might embrace her religion.[1] With these conditions, she was given in marriage to the Northumbrian prince, and *Paulinus*, one of the monks whom Pope Gregory had sent over to aid Augustine, and who was now consecrated Bishop of Northumbria by the Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied her to look after her spiritual wants (A. D. 625).

---

[1] *Bede*, II. 12. (Tr.)

Edwin was for a long time making up his mind, and it was not until after two years had elapsed that he finally took the step. He had escaped death at the hands of an assassin sent by the king of the West Saxons to take his life, and now promised that, if he should return safe and victorious from the war he was about to wage with this deceitful foe, he would at once enter the Church, and, as a pledge of his sincerity, had his young daughter baptized by Bishop Paulinus.[2] He returned victorious, but still hesitated to carry his promise into effect, and proposed a conference with his priests and thanes.[3] Each in turn was asked his opinion of the new religion, and the first to answer was *Coifi*, the pagan high-priest. He declared that "the religion they had hitherto followed was worth nothing," because "none had served the gods with more zeal than himself," while "he had received no favors from them, and others had received many." "If, then," he continued, "you have found, after searching examination, that the new religion is more efficacious, let us hasten to embrace it."[4] The next to give his opinion was a thane, who said that "life might be compared to the flight of a sparrow that enters a hall at night. Whence it comes, or whither it goes, no one can say; neither can any one say what preceded, or what will follow, the brief span of man's life. If, therefore," he concluded, "the new religion can tell us something certain of these things, it should be followed."[1]

---

[1] *Bede*, II. 9. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[3] *Bede*, II. 13. (Tr.)

[4] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

The assembly then expressed a wish that Paulinus should speak and explain the truths of the Christian religion; and when he had ceased, Coifi was the first to rise and assent to all the bishop had said. "I have," said he, "for these many years, been in search of truth, and the more I have searched, the more hopeless has seemed the task. I now declare I have found that which gives life and salvation and eternal blessedness. I am therefore in favor of at once cursing and committing to the flames the altars which we have so uselessly consecrated."[2]

The king immediately declared that he renounced idolatry and embraced the faith of Christ. The high-priest was the first to profane the pagan temples, by casting a spear into one of them; and the people, seeing that the gods were silent, set upon both temples and idols, and utterly demolished them.

The king was baptized with great solemnity, by Paulinus, on Easter day, A. D. 627, in a wooden church hastily erected for the occasion, and his example was followed by his sons and great numbers of the nobility and people.[3] The splendid minster of York, the metropolitan church of Northern England, was afterward built on the site of this little wooden church, and the design of Pope Gregory thus carried into effect.

Some time after this event, Paulinus accompanied Edwin and Ethelburga to a royal villa in the northern part of the kingdom, and, while there, was incessantly engaged for thirty-six days in catechizing the people of the neighboring villages, whom he baptized in the river which flowed close by.

Paulinus, with that zeal which always characterizes truly apostolical men, did not confine his labors to the northern side of the Humber alone; but, passing to the south of that river, preached the faith to the inhabitants of the maritime province of Lindsay, many of whom he baptized in the Trent. The beautiful cathedral of Lincoln owes its origin to the mission of Paulinus, and here also, in the year 628, he consecrated *Honorius*, the fourth successor to Augustine in the see of Canterbury, and one of the first companions of the saint in his mission to England, over thirty years before. The then reigning pope, *Honorius I.*, sent the *pallium* to each of two metropolitans, and ordained that, in the event of the death of either, the survivor might appoint and consecrate his successor, without referring the matter to Rome. The great distance between Rome and England, the difficulty of travel by land and sea, and the inconveniences that might arise from protracted delay in a country where the Church was still struggling for existence, rendered such provision necessary.[1] The Pope also wrote to King Edwin to congratulate him on his conversion, but when the letter reached England, the king had gone to his reward, six years after his baptism,[2] but not until he had carried the power of his arms far into the north, where he left a perpetual record of his presence in the fortress which he built on the site of the city of Edinburgh (Edwin's-borough).

---

[1] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, II. 3. (Tr.)

[3] *Bede*, II. 14. (Tr.)

The Britons of Wales continued to entertain feelings of the most bitter hatred against Edwin; and their leader, *Ceadwalla*, though a Christian, entered into an alliance with *Penda*, the idolatrous king of Mercia, for the purpose of humbling the Northumbrians and their king. They invaded Northumbria, defeated and slew Edwin and his eldest son at the battle of Hatfield, October 11, A. D. 633. Penda, though he had sworn to save the life of the youngest son, brutally murdered him as soon as the young prince fell into his hands. The conduct of Ceadwalla, though a Christian, was still more barbarous than that of the idolatrous Penda. For a whole year he traversed the kingdom of Northumbria from north to south, ravaging the country and putting the inhabitants to the sword. Nearly every vestige of Christianity was obliterated from the soil of this once flourishing kingdom.[3]

Paulinus withdrew from his see, leaving it in charge of

---

[1] The beautiful letter of the Pope to Archbishop Honorius is given in Bede, II. 18. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, II. 17. (Tr.)

[3] *Bede*, II. 20. (Tr.)

James, the Roman deacon, and conducted Queen Ethelburga to her brother in Kent, where, after sending her two sons and one daughter to her cousin, *Dagobert*, king of the Franks, she devoted the remainder of her life to the service of God. The titular bishop of Rochester, having been drowned in the Mediterranean while going on a mission to Rome, Paulinus was appointed to his place, with the consent of the king, by the Archbishop Honorius, whom he had himself consecrated at Lincoln. Here he died, after having spent forty-three years laboring to convert the Anglo-Saxons. But, though the prospects of Christianity now seemed so hopeless in Northumbria, they were shortly to open with greater brilliancy than ever, under a prince whose heroic achievements were destined to eclipse those of the most distinguished of his predecessors.

This was *Oswald*, the son of Ethelfrid and of the sister of King Edwin. After the defeat of his father, he made his escape, and, in company with many young nobles, sought and obtained protection and hospitality among the Scots, and during his stay among them embraced Christianity.

After the death of Edwin, he returned to Northumbria, and with a small, but heroic and resolute band of followers, disputed the sovereignty with Ceadwalla. The hostile armies met at *Denisesburn*, near the great wall of the Emperor Severus. Oswald, on the night before the battle, erected a large cross, before which he and his followers prostrated themselves, and besought the God of battles to favor their cause. He went forth on the next day with his handful of followers against the multitudes of his adversary, and gained a complete and decisive victory. Ceadwalla was slain, and the cause of Christianity was once more triumphant to the north of the Humber. Oswald at once sent to the monastery of *Iona*, which had been founded by Columba, to ask for missionaries to convert his people. The abbot first sent *Corman*, a man of austere habits and stubborn character, who made but little progress in his mission, and shortly returned to his monastery. *Aïdan* was next chosen and consecrated bishop, and by his prudence, conciliating disposition, and affable manners, won the hearts and gained the souls of this barbarous people.[1] Oswald left him at liberty to establish his bishopric in whatever part of the kingdom might seem best suited for that purpose. Aïdan, instead of selecting the existing see of York, established himself on the island of *Lindisfarne*, on the coast of Bernicia, which, in many respects, bore a striking resemblance to Iona. The Irish monks were now to take up, and prosecute with vigor, the work which the Roman monks had commenced. Recruits were constantly arriving from Ireland and Scotland to help on the good work, and share the labors of Aïdan. The bishop, following the practice of his country, erected a monastery for their accommodation by the side of his cathedral, on the island of Lindisfarne. Aïdan was, in every sense, the model of a true bishop and an apostolic missionary. "He was," says Bede, "a pontiff inspired with a passionate love of goodness; and, withal, most gentle and moderate." He was filled with zeal for his holy calling, possessed of unbounded charity toward the poor, self-denying to himself, and tender with others. Between him and King Oswald, there always existed the warmest sympathy and the most intimate friendship. The king gave in his conduct an example of every Christian virtue, and did all in his power to second the efforts of the missionaries. He was profuse in his alms, considerate toward the poor, and provided amply for strangers who came in crowds to learn the wisdom of Christ at the feet of Aïdan. Having, during his long residence among the Scots, acquired a perfect knowledge of the Celtic language, he not unfrequently acted as interpreter between his subjects and the missionaries, who were not yet sufficiently acquainted with the Anglo-Saxon tongue to dispense with such aid. And so great was his influence not only with his own countrymen, but with the Picts and Scots also, that he was acknowledged Bretwalda by both nations. But all this prosperity was soon to come to an end. Oswald perished in battle, fighting against Penda, his old enemy, at the head of the Mercians, A. D. 642, in the thirty-eighth year of his age. His last words were worthy of a Christian king.

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 5. (Tr.)

"May God," said he, "save their souls."[1] Penda ordered his head and hands to be cut off, impaled, and set up as a warning to others. In this condition they remained for a whole year, when *Oswy*, the brother of the murdered king, obtained possession of them, and had the head conveyed to Aïdan, at Lindisfarne, and the hands to the chapel of the royal fortress, at Bamborough. The Church reveres him as a martyr, and the English nation as one of its most glorious saints. After the death of Oswald, Northumbria was again divided into the two kingdoms of Bernicia and Deïra, over the latter of which *Oswin*, the son of ill-fated Osric, ruled.

Bishop Aïdan went through both kingdoms, preaching the Gospel of Christ, and while in Deïra shared, when practicable, the hospitality of Oswin, with whom he was on terms of intimate friendship.

The good feeling which had existed for many years between the two Northumbrian princes, was interrupted by *Oswy*, king of Bernicia. Yielding to the feelings of jealousy, which the greater popularity enjoyed by Oswin among the Northumbrian chiefs had excited in his breast, he marched at the head of a powerful army against him. Oswin, conscious that his own forces were much inferior to those of his adversary, advised his followers to consult for their own safety. He himself took refuge with one of his nobles, on whom he had lately conferred great favors, and to whose loyalty and honor he thought he might safely commit himself in this emergency. The ungrateful noble had the meanness to betray his king and benefactor into the hands of his enemy, by whom he was put to death, August 20, A. D. 651.

Twelve days after the death of Oswin, his friend Aïdan, during one of his many missionary journeys, fell sick, and died under a tent which had been pitched in haste at the back of a modest church he himself had built. His body was conveyed to Lindisfarne, and buried in the cathedral of the monastery.[2]

Finan, also a monk of Iona, was the first successor to the holy Aïdan. He had the happiness of baptizing *Peada*, the son of Penda, the terrible king of the Mercians, or Middle Angles. During one of these intervals of peace, which were rare at that time in the Northumbrian annals, Peada came to the court of Oswy to ask in marriage his daughter *Alchfleda.*[1] His request was refused, unless he should renounce idolatry, and become a Christian. He set himself to the study of the Christian religion, and, after he had gained a knowledge of it, declared that he would embrace it, even though his suit should be unsuccessful. This conversion seems to have been principally owing to *Alchfred*, the brother of Alchfleda, who had married a daughter of King Penda, and between whom and Peada there existed a brotherly love. Peada returned to his own country with his young wife, and accompanied by four missionaries from Iona, at the head of whom was *Diuma*, who was consecrated first bishop of the Mercians.[2]

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 9, 12. (Tr.)

[2] *Joan. Tynemouth*, ap. *Bolland*, T. IV., Aug. p. 53. (Tr.)

Strange to say, Penda did not seem displeased with the conduct of his son, and was so tolerant of the new faith as to allow the missionaries to go through his kingdom and proclaim it to his people. He, however, showed his utter contempt of all Christians who did not practice what they professed.

Sigebert, the king of Essex, was in the habit of frequently visiting King Oswy, by whom he was instructed in the Christian faith. After consulting with the leaders of his nation, according to the Anglo-Saxon custom, he consented to receive baptism, which was conferred upon him by Finan, at the village of Oswy, near the old Roman wall of the Emperor Severus, at the same place where, a short time after, Peada, as has been mentioned, was baptized.[3] Sigebert applied for missionaries to go with him to his own kingdom, and Oswy selected *Cedd*, an Anglo-Saxon monk of Lindisfarne, who had been sent into Mercia with Peada, and afterward recalled, as the most fitting person for this mission. He afterward went to Lindisfarne to be consecrated bishop of the East Saxons, and, returning, fixed his episcopal see at London, formerly occupied by the Roman monk Mellitus. King Sigebert was slain by his kinsmen, in the year 660, and Bishop Cedd survived him only four years. The latter, while on his way to Lindisfarne, was seized with a contagious disease, and died at the monastery of Lastingham, which he himself had founded.[1]

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 25. (Tr.)
[2] *Bede*, III. 21. (Tr.)
[3] *Bede*, III. 22. (Tr.)

The port of Genoa was at this time much frequented by Anglo-Saxon traders, from whom some of the inhabitants had acquired a knowledge of the language of the distant islanders. Among these was one *Birinus*, whose origin is unknown, but who, having received a commission from Pope Honorius I. to go and labor for the conversion of the countrymen of those traders, was consecrated by the Bishop of Genoa. Birinus landed in Wessex in the year 634, and at once commenced his labors among the people of this kingdom. Oswald, king of Northumbria, had sought in marriage the daughter of *Cynegils*, king of Wessex, and, coming in person to seek his bride, he found Birinus at the court of his father-in-law. The two set about converting Cynegils, and they were rejoiced to find their labors shortly crowned with success. Oswald stood godfather[2] to the king of Wessex. He was baptized at *Dorchester*,[3] which afterward became the episcopal see of Birinus. Birinus labored in his new mission with the zeal of an apostle, converting multitudes and erecting numerous churches; and so great was the admiration which the people entertained for one who could voluntarily exile himself from his own country to work for the weal of others, that his praises were, for many years after his death, celebrated in their songs. He died A. D. 650.

Cenwalch, who succeeded to his father, Cynegils, refused to accept the teachings of Christianity. Driven from his throne by Penda, whose sister he had refused to marry, he sought an asylum with good king *Anna* of Essex, through whose influence he was brought into the Church. He again got possession of his kingdom in the year 648, and, being solicitous to spread the faith among his subjects, named *Agilbert*,[1] a Gaul, who had spent many years studying in the Irish monasteries, Bishop of Dorchester, in place of Birinus. In virtue of a promise made to his father on his death-bed, Cenwalch founded the great monastery of Winchester for his Saxon subjects.

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 23. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, III. 7. (Tr.)

[3] This is not the present city of Dorchester, but a place near Oxford, on the Thames. The see was afterward transferred to Lincoln. Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 284, note. (Tr.)

The majority of Cenwalch's subjects could speak neither the Latin nor the Celtic language, and could not, therefore, converse with the missionaries directly. On this account, the king resolved to establish a bishopric at Winchester, and to appoint to it one who understood the Saxon language. Such a one was *Wina*, who, though he had made his studies and had been ordained in France, was perfectly conversant with Saxon, and became the first bishop of Winchester.[2]

Some years later on (A. D. 686), St. Wilfrid, who was himself in exile in Sussex, met there *Ceadwalla*, a descendant of Cenwalch's, who had been driven from his kingdom. The prince, to whom the saint rendered some kind offices, shortly after came again into possession of his kingdom, and overran Sussex, Kent, and Isle of Wight. In virtue of a vow which he had made before attempting the reduction of this island, he gave one-fourth of it to St. Wilfrid, to be applied to religious uses. He was, however, still a pagan, and both cruel and vindictive. He ravaged Kent with fire and sword, and, to avenge the wounds he had received in his efforts to reduce the Isle of Wight, put all its inhabitants, consisting of twelve hundred families of Jutes, to a frightful death. But, having returned to Wessex, he began to reflect on the words he had heard from Wilfrid during his exile in Sussex, and, sending for the saint, begged to be more fully instructed in the Christian religion. He was so struck with its truth and the beauty of its moral precepts, in such marked contrast with his own conduct, that he at once set out on a pilgrimage to Rome, where he was baptized by the Pope,[1] and died while still clad in the robes of baptismal innocence.

---

[1] *Bede*, l. c. (Tr.)

[2] There were in Wessex besides Dorchester two other bishoprics, viz., Winchester and Sherburne; the latter was afterward transferred to Salisbury. Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 284, note. (Tr.)

His successor, *Ina*, after a reign of thirty-seven years, also made a pilgrimage to Rome, and was the first to establish the practice of paying Peter's pence (A. D. 725). Among the Saxons and Franks, long hair was a mark of noble birth; but *Ina*, wishing to indicate that he renounced all worldly honor and distinction, had his long flowing locks cut off. He died shortly after having given these tokens of obedience and humility.

Sussex was the last kingdom of the heptarchy to embrace the Christian religion, which it received from St. Wilfrid, who, exiled from his own see of York, and from the Christian kingdoms of Mercia and Wessex, sought and obtained a secure asylum among the South Saxons, whom, in return for their generous hospitality, he converted to the faith of Christ. *Edilwalch*, the king of Sussex, had already been converted by his wife, a Mercian princess, but the great bulk of the people were firmly attached to their ancient faith, and had obstinately repelled all advances of former Christian missionaries. They reproached those of their nation who had already embraced Christianity with apostasy from the traditions of their fathers and the religion of their ancient gods. To this people, so wedded to their errors and so averse to change, did St. Wilfrid come as an exile and a missionary. He moved the hearts of the king and queen to pity and generosity by the tale of his sufferings, and obtained from them permission to speak of God and His holy Church to their subjects. Strengthened by the good-will of the king, the saint commenced preaching the Gospel of Christ to these heathens. He told them of the power of God, of His goodness and His mercy, and exposed the foolishness of adoring idols. His words soon had their effect. His first converts were two hundred and fifty slaves whom the king gave him, and who, after they had been baptized, were informed by the saint that they were now freemen, because, having become children of Christ, they ceased to be slaves (A. D. 678). These were followed by princes and nobles, and people of lower degree, who came in great numbers to receive baptism at the hands either of the saint himself or one of the four priests who accompanied him. So numerous were the conversions that the king felt justified in compelling the few who held off to follow the example of the body of their fellow-countrymen.[1] Wilfrid also taught the inhabitants the art of taking in nets the fish which abounded in their rivers.[2] In gratitude for all these benefits, the king gave the apostle and his companions the domain of *Selsey* as a residence during their exile. Here, Wilfrid founded a monastery, which became, in the year 711, the most southern bishopric of England.[3]

---

[1] Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 399. (Tr.)

The kingdom of Sussex was at first subject to the Bishop of Winchester, but it was finally determined to give it a bishop of its own. The first chosen to fill this office was *Edbert*, abbot of the monastery of Selsey, which had been founded by Wilfrid. After five years of ceaseless labor, this apostle had the consolation of seeing nearly all the Southern Saxons converted to Christianity, and the Church firmly established in their country.

As we have seen, Pope Gregory the Great had intended to establish in England two metropolitan sees—namely, London and York—each of which was to have twelve suffragan bishops. St. Augustine, however, preferred Canterbury to London, and the successors of St. Gregory, while still adhering to the leading idea of their predecessor, acquiesced in the choice. Nevertheless, it was many years before this was carried fully into effect. For a period of seventy years, England had only one metropolitan, and his jurisdiction did not extend over the whole island. Deusdedit, the sixth Archbishop of Canterbury, having been taken off by a pestilence, it became necessary to appoint another in his place; and King Oswy of Northumbria, using the privilege in spiritual affairs, which seems to have been accorded to his office of

---

[1] *Bede*, IV. 13. *Eddius*, c. 39. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[3] The see was transferred to Chichester in 1070. Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 398, note. (Tr.)

Bretwalda, selected for this important see, Wighard, a Saxon monk of Canterbury, who had been educated in the school founded by the first missionaries sent from Rome by St. Gregory, and was universally esteemed for his learning and virtue.[1] Oswy and the king of Kent, desirous at once of conciliating national prejudice and maintaining a close bond of union with the Head of the Church, sent Wighard to Rome, to be consecrated by the Pope. But as Wighard and nearly all his companions had died shortly after coming to Rome, the two kings left the choice of his successor to the Pope.

Vitalian, who then occupied the papal chair, was slow to make choice of a man to fill so important a position. After casting about for some time, his first choice fell upon *Hadrian*, an African by birth, and abbot of a monastery near Naples. The abbot pleaded his unworthiness, and directed the Pope's attention to a Greek monk named *Theodore*, born at Tarsus, but then residing at Rome, whose knowledge was so profound and varied that he was surnamed the Philosopher. He had already reached the venerable age of sixty-six.[2] The Pope accepted this choice on condition that Hadrian would accompany Theodore to England, lest the Greek traditions of the latter might tempt him to depart from Roman usage. With this understanding, Theodore was consecrated by the Pope, March 26, A. D. 668, and, in company with Abbot Hadrian, set out for England, where he arrived May 27, A. D. 669.

Through the co-operation of the powerful king of Northumbria, Theodore was received in England without the slightest opposition from either kings or prelates, and at once assumed the title and exercised the jurisdiction of Archbishop of Britain. This, however, can not be said to have been an assumption of unwarranted jurisdiction on the part of Theodore, for Pope Vitalian conferred upon him all the prerogatives that had been granted by Gregory the Great to St. Augustine.[3]

---

[1] *Bede*, Hist. Eccl. III. 29; also, Hist. Abbatum in Wiramutha ad Girvum, n. 3. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, Hist. Abb., c. 3; also, Hist. Eccl. IV. 1. (Tr.)

[3] *Bede*, IV. 2. See also Diploma of Pope Vitalian in Act. SS. *Bolland.*, T. VI., Septemb., p. 59. (Tr.)

Theodore at first confined his labors to Northumbria and Mercia, and, having provided for the government of the Church in these kingdoms, he set out, in company with Hadrian, to make a visitation of the whole of England. During this journey he settled many sanguinary feuds, reconciled princes and nobles, restored ecclesiastical discipline where it had become relaxed, corrected abuses, introduced the Roman practice in celebrating the Easter festival,[1] and the parish system instead of the missionary stations which had previously existed, and persuaded princes and nobles to second his efforts by erecting churches on their demesnes.[2]

Having thus provided for the establishment of parishes, he next proceeded to the division of dioceses. These were at that time of vast extent; for, with the exception of Kent, each kingdom of the heptarchy had but one bishopric. Theodore therefore called a council at Hereford, September 24, A. D. 673, the first held in the Anglo-Saxon Church, but was unable to carry his measure.[3] The council, however, passed two decrees of great importance, the first of which provided that bishops should in no way disturb the monasteries; and the second, that monks should not pass from one monastery to another without the permission of their abbot.[4] But, though Theodore did not succeed in having his plan of dividing the dioceses adopted in the council of Hereford, he nevertheless persisted in carrying it into effect, which he did with the energy and resolution characteristic of great minds, but which seemed also, at times, closely allied to violence. So thorough and general was his work, that at the close of the seventh century the number of dioceses in England had increased from seven to seventeen.[5] It is to be regretted that, in carrying this design into execution, Archbishop Theodore became involved in a long and angry contest with the great and saintly prelate, *Wilfrid*, bishop of York.

---

[1] *Bede*, IV. 2. (Tr.)

[2] *Thos. de Elmilan*, Hist. Monast. S. Aug., p. 289. (Tr.)

[3] *Bede*, IV. 5. (Tr.)

[4] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[5] They were: In Kent, Canterbury and Rochester; in Essex, London; in East Anglia, Dunwich and Helmham; in Sussex, Selsey; in Wessex, Winchester and Sherburne; in Mercia, Litchfield, Leicester, Hereford, Worcester, and Sydnacester; in Northumbria, York, Hexham, Lindisfarne, and Whithern (*Candida Casa*, the ancient see of Ninian, the apostle of the Southern Picts). *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 51. (Tr.)

Wilfrid had drawn upon himself the anger of Egfrid, king of Northumbria, by advising the princess *Etheldreda*, whom the king had compelled to marry him,[1] to persist in the resolution of dedicating her virginity to God. An open rupture did not, however, take place until after Egfrid had married the princess *Ermenburga*, to whom Wilfrid gave offense, by reprimanding her for frivolous and improper conduct. She represented to the king, with all the persuasiveness of female eloquence, that the fearless bishop was proud, wealthy, and more powerful than became a subject. To the mind of the king, already irritated against the bishop, these words were galling; but, fearful of making a direct attack upon him, he had the cunning to engage Archbishop Theodore in his designs;[2] and, it must be admitted, the proceedings of the metropolitan were, in this instance, harsh and unjustifiable. He came to York by invitation from the king, and, in the absence of Wilfrid, divided his diocese up into three districts, over each of which he placed a bishop consecrated by himself.[3] Wilfrid protested; appealed to the Canons; and, finding everything else unavailing, set out for Rome, to lay the matter before Pope Agatho. While at Rome, he received intelligence of the death of the sainted queen Etheldreda (June 23, A. D. 679), whose friend and spiritual father he had been, and by whose advice he undertook the journey to the shrine of the Apostles.

Agatho summoned a synod of the Roman clergy to examine into the case. They gave judgment in favor of Wilfrid, and decided that the bishops appointed by Theodore should be deposed, and replaced by others, to be chosen by the injured bishop.[4]

Wilfrid, on his arrival in England with the Papal decree, was seized by Egfrid at the instigation of his wife, and cast into prison. He was released through the powerful influence of the Abbess *Ebba*,[1] but on condition that he would never again enter the dominions of Egfrid. It was during this exile (A. D. 681–686) that he evangelized the South Saxons. Toward the close of his life, Theodore (†A. D. 690), conscious that he had seriously wronged Wilfrid, sent for him, became reconciled with him, and offered to appoint him his successor in the see of Canterbury, because of his great knowledge and acquaintance with the practices of Rome.[2] Egfrid having died in the meantime, Theodore wrote to *Aldfrid*, his successor, and persuaded him to reinstate Wilfrid in the see of York, and to restore to him all the rights and prerogatives that had formerly belonged to that bishopric. But though fully reinstated in his diocese, Wilfrid was not free from the persecutions of his enemies. The deposed bishops took every occasion to annoy and harass him; and the king, who was offended by his austere severity, began to entertain a dislike of him, which was assiduously encouraged by his many enemies.[3] After five years of ceaseless conflict, he was required by royal order to surrender the magnificent monastery of Ripon, which he had been at great pains to beautify and adorn, for the residence of a new bishop, to be appointed by the king.[4] This he peremptorily refused to do, and, again fleeing from his diocese, sought refuge with *Ethelred*, king of Mercia, by whom he was appointed to the vacant see of *Litchfield*[5] (A. D. 692). Here he resided eleven years (A. D. 692–703), during which he appears to have lived a quiet and retired life, waiting for the coming of better days. In the year 692, *Brithwald*, an Anglo-Saxon, who was chosen to succeed Archbishop Theodore in the metropolitan see of Canterbury, also took sides against Wilfrid. He called an assembly of bishops and abbots at *Nesterfeld* (A. D. 703), in Northumbria, near the monastery of Ripon, in which Wilfrid consented to take part, on condition that justice should be done him. But this promise was far from being kept; on the contrary, an attempt was made to obtain his signature to a fraudulent document, by which he was made to resign all claims to the government of any bishopric or monastery whatever.[1] Fortunately he received friendly warning of this design, and indignantly refused to comply with the wishes of his enemies. This having failed, he was offered the monastery of Ripon, on condition that he should not leave it without the royal permission or exercise any episcopal functions. Wilfrid still more indignantly repelled this attempt "to violate the sacred character with which he was invested;" and added: "I appeal boldly to the Holy See. I invite any of you who desire my deposition to go there with me and receive decision."[2] He at once set out for Rome.

---

[1] Thom. *Eliens.*, c. 4, 8. (Tr.)

[2] *Eddius*, c. 20, 23, (Tr.)

[3] Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 376, note. (Tr.)

[4] *Eddius*, c. 28, 30.

---

[1] *Eddius*, c. 37.

[2] *Eddius*, c. 41.

[3] *Eddius*, c. 43.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] *Eddius*, c. 43. (TR.)

The papal throne was at this time occupied by John VI., who summoned a council of the Roman bishops and clergy to inquire into the controversy. Archbishop Brithwald also sent envoys to Rome in the name of the assembly of Nesterfeld,[3] and in this way a fair hearing was given to both parties. Wilfrid read a paper before the council, in which he begged the Pope to enforce the decisions of his predecessors, Agatho, Benedict, and Sergius. Fearful, however, that the king of Northumbria might oppose the full execution of these, and conscious of the necessity of being moderate in his demands, Wilfrid consented to resign the see of York, with all its dependent monasteries, to be disposed of according to the Pope's pleasure, but expressed a desire to retain the monasteries of Ripon and Hexham, with all their possessions. A hearing was next given to the envoys who accused Wilfrid of having treated the assembly of Nesterfeld with contempt. The council, after it had sat for four months and held seventy sessions, declared Wilfrid innocent, and granted his request.

Wilfrid returned to England in the year 705, and had an interview at London with Archbishop Brithwald, who promised to submit to the papal decision, and to recall the decrees of Nesterfeld.[1]

---

[1] *Eddius*, c. 44. (Tr.)

[2] *Eddius*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[3] *Eddius*, c. 47. (Tr.)

Aldfrid, king of Northumbria, at first refused to recognize the judgment of the Holy See; but, falling ill shortly after, he came to a better mind, and said, on his death-bed: "I command my successor, whoever he may be, in the name of the Lord, and for the repose of my soul and his own, to make peace with Wilfrid."[2] The abbess *Ælfleda*, sister of the king, but more distinguished for her exalted virtues than for her noble birth, was a witness of the king's words, and at an assembly called shortly after at *Nid*, by Archbishop Brithwald, testified that it was her brother's last will that the bishops, abbots, and lords assembled should do justice to Wilfrid and render obedience to Rome. The monasteries of Hexham and Ripon were thus given to the holy bishop, and a general reconciliation between him and his enemies took place.[3]

This great bishop and apostolic missionary died at *Oundle*, a monastic foundation near Northampton, which he himself had dedicated to St. Andrew the Apostle, on the twenty-third day of June, A. D. 709, at the age of seventy-six, after having been bishop forty-four years.

Notwithstanding these drawbacks and difficulties, it is nevertheless true that the mission of Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian had a great influence in giving organization, unity, stability, and efficiency to the Church in England. They were learned and energetic; equally skilled in theological and secular science, and labored strenuously to diffuse a knowledge of both among the Anglo-Saxon Christians. Theodore had brought a copy of Homer with him from Rome, and passed some of his leisure moments in the perusal of that great classic. Schools were established, in which, besides the theological branches, Greek, Latin, mathematics, and astronomy were taught. So proficient did the Anglo-Saxons become in these departments of secular knowledge, that they were shortly able to compute the Pascal cycle, wrote Latin verses with correctness, ease, and grace, and spoke both Latin and Greek as readily as their mother-tongue.[1] Music and chant, which up to this time had been confined to the monasteries of Canterbury and York, now became common all over England.[2]

---

[1] *Eddius*, c. 54. (Tr.)

[2] *Eddius*, c. 56. (Tr.)

[3] The Anglia Sacra of *Henry Wharton*, in which much historical matter has been carefully and diligently collected, is of great importance on this subject. London, 1791, 2 vols. folio.

A reconciliation was also effected between the ancient Britons of Wales and the Anglo-Saxon converts; and, in consequence of the spread of Christianity throughout England by the labors of Roman, Irish, Frankish, and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, the old British Church coalesced with those of Irish and Roman origin. But notwithstanding this friendly intercourse between the two Churches, there existed among the Britons certain practices at variance with those of Rome, which they tenaciously clung to, and which for a time they struggled strenuously to maintain. The principal of these were—1. The ancient British rite of administering the sacrament of *Baptism;* 2. The computation of the festival of Easter according to the Jewish cycle; and 3. The form of ecclesiastical tonsure.[3] In the administration of baptism, the ancient Britons were accustomed to omit the anointing of the head. But this point was not regarded by the British Church of as great importance as the difference between the two rules of celebrating the Pascal festival, and was no serious hindrance to an accommodation. The real difficulty lay in the Easter computation.

It may be well to remark, that, from the very earliest ages, the question regarding the exact time of celebrating Easter had given rise to many difficulties. It came up at the Council of Nice, and the Fathers passed a decree, enacting that the celebration of the Easter festival should take place on the first Sunday after the full moon of the vernal equinox. This rule, followed by the Roman Church, was introduced into ancient Britain by the early missionaries, and into Ireland and Caledonia respectively by St. Patrick and St. Columba.

---

[1] Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop. art. Wilfrid. *Bede*, IV. 2.

[2] *Bede*, loc. cit. (Tr.)

[3] There were at this time three different forms of tonsure: 1. That of *St. Peter*, or the Roman, which consisted in cleanly shaving the top of the head, and leaving a crown of hair at the base, symbolical of the Crown of Thorns. 2. That of *St. Paul*, in which the whole head was shaved. 3. That of the Apostle *St. John*, called by its adversaries that of *Simon Magus*, and in use among the Irish and Britons, in which the front of the head was shaved so as to resemble a crescent, or semi-circle, and the hair allowed to fall down upon the back.

In this computation, the Jewish cycle of eighty-four years. which contained an astronomical error, had been followed; and the Alexandrians, having detected the error, introduced a more exact calculation, which was adopted by all the Eastern Churches. In the year 444, a difference of nearly a month intervened between the days on which Easter was celebrated at Rome and at Alexandria, and Pope Leo the Great ordered that the festival should be observed on the 23d of April, the day on which it fell according to the Alexandrian computation. Toward the middle of the sixth century, the cycle of *Denys the Little*, which exactly corresponded with that of Alexandria, was adopted at Rome, and hence, from this time forward, a complete uniformity existed in the two Churches regarding the celebration of Easter.

The Britons having been cut off from intercourse with Rome by the Saxon invasion, retained their ancient rule, and it is precisely their fidelity to this rule which proves their fidelity to Rome. When they again came in contact with the Anglo-Saxons after the latter had become Christians, or at least some of them, they found the Roman rule prevailing regarding the celebration of Easter. St. Augustine had introduced it into England, and as he had received from Pope Gregory authority over the British bishops, he made every effort to bring them in accord with the Church of Rome. "As to the British bishops," said the Pope, "we commit them entirely to your care, that you may instruct the ignorant, strengthen the feeble, and correct the evil."[1] Augustine accordingly set to work to carry out the instructions of the Pope. He obtained the favor of a conference with the principal bishops and doctors of Wales on the banks of Severn, which separated the Saxons from the Britons (A. D. 599 or 603). Though he performed a miracle in proof of the divine sanction which was accorded to his authority,[1] the Britons refused to comply with his request till they should have consulted their people, and obtained their consent to depart from practices of so great antiquity. A second conference was held soon after, but the Britons, dreading the authority of one whom they did not know, and who resided in the territory of their implacable enemies, refused to comply with the Roman usage, or to acknowledge the archbishop's authority.[2] The monks of the monastery of Bangor also attended this conference to the number of three thousand, and the holy archbishop, indignant that they would not interest themselves in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, prophesied that punishment would shortly come upon them. This prophecy was fulfilled some years later, when *Ethelfrid*, the Pagan king of Northumbria, marched into their territory, and in one battle slew twelve hundred of them.[3]

---

[1] Epist. IX. 64. (Tr.)

Although Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, had informed the Irish that they were not observing the Roman rule with regard to the time of the celebration of Easter, they took no steps to correct their error until after Pope Honorius I. had written to them on the subject (A. D. 630). Upon the receipt of this letter, the bishops and abbots of the South of Ireland assembled in council at Old Leighlin, where the most distinguished of their number argued that, as their ancestors had yielded obedience to the decrees of the Holy See, it was their plain duty to celebrate the Easter festival according to the instructions of the Pope. But, as the decision of this council excited considerable opposition, it was determined to send an embassy to Rome, who, as *Cummian* says, "should go as children to learn the wish of their parent."[4] On their return, they reported that they had seen at Rome people from all quarters of the globe, celebrating Easter, on the same day, and from that time (A. D. 633) forward, the Roman rule was observed in the whole of the South of Ireland.

The great monastery on the island of Iona maintained a close connection with those of the north of Ireland, and seems to have exercised so powerful an influence over them that they continually looked to it for direction and counsel. As the monks of this celebrated cloister were devotedly attached to their traditions, and regarded with religious reverence all the practices of their great founder, they refused to give up their ancient rule of celebrating the Easter festival, and adopt that of Rome; and their example was applauded and followed by the monasteries in the north of Ireland. The Irish rule had been introduced into Northumbria by *Aïdan*, bishop of Lindisfarne, and followed by his successor, Bishop *Finan*, like himself, a monk of Iona. In the meantime, other missionaries, who had learned the Roman rule abroad, came into Northumbria, and, as their practices clashed with those followed by the monks of Iona, this country became the battle-field of the two parties.

---

[1] *Bede*, II. 2. (Tr.)
[2] *Bede*, V. 18. (Tr.)
[3] *Bede*, V. 18. (Tr.)
[4] Epist. p. 23. *Bede*, II. 3. (Tr.)

Among the most distinguished of those who advocated and adopted the Roman rule were *Nonan*, an Irishman, who had studied on the continent, the Roman deacon *James* of York, and Wilfrid, who had studied at Rome, and who, on his return, so influenced the mind of *Alchfrid*, one of the kings of Northumbria, in favor of the Roman rule, that the latter insisted on introducing it into the monastery of Ripon. The monks of this establishment refused compliance, and declared that they would rather give up this sanctuary than abandon their traditions. Alchfrid accepted their proposal, and installed Wilfrid as abbot.[1] *Colman*, who had succeeded Finan as Bishop of Lindisfarne, A. D. 661, and who, like his predecessor, was both an Irishman and a monk of Iona, was the most strenuous advocate of the Celtic rule. He possessed a strong ally in *Cedd*, Bishop of the East Saxons, who, though an Anglo-Saxon by birth, had been educated in Ireland.

The royal family were also divided on this question. Oswy, who had been baptized and educated by the Celtic monks, and who spoke their language with fluency, and the princess *Hilda*, abbess of the double monastery of Whitby, who had received the veil from Bishop Aïdan, naturally enough adopted their rule of celebrating Easter; while his queen, *Eanfleda*, and his son, *Alchfrid*, followed that of Rome. In the royal palace, therefore, there were two celebrations of Easter, and while King Oswy was feasting and rejoicing, Eanfleda and Alchfrid were still fasting and doing penance.

---

[1] *Bede*, Hist. Eccl. iii. 25, v. 19, and Life of *Cuthbert*, c. 8. (Tr.)

Oswy, in order to bring this tiresome and dangerous dispute to a close, convoked a *Witenagemot*, or parliament, at Whitby (Streoneshalch), composed not only of the principal ecclesiastics of the country, but also of all those who had a right to sit in the national councils of the Anglo-Saxons, where it was publicly disputed in his presence. The king opened the conference by saying, that, as they all worshiped the same God, it was but fitting that all should follow the same rule in all things pertaining to that worship. He then called upon Bishop Colman to state his arguments. The bishop stated that he and his followers had received their rule of celebrating Easter from their predecessors, who, in their turn, had received it from St. John the Apostle and Evangelist. "We keep Easter," said he, "as St. Columba of the Cell did—as did *Polycarp* and all his disciples of old. Out of reverence for our ancestors we dare not, and we will not change."[1]

Wilfrid replied that he and his adherents "kept Easter as it was kept by all the Christians at Rome—as it was kept in Africa, in Asia, in Egypt, in Greece, and throughout Christendom;" and that "the Picts and Britons foolishly persisted in contradicting all the rest of the world."[2] He also stated that the example of St. John was not to the point, as he celebrated Easter after the manner of the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon, without regard to the day of the week, whereas the Irish always observed the Sunday following.

Colman insisted that St. Columba and his successors, who had given so many proofs of sanctity and Divine favor by miracles and holiness of life, could not have been in the wrong; and declared that "he would forever follow their teaching and example." To this the abbot Wilfrid answered that "he did not deny that these were servants of God, and beloved by Him," but maintained that, as they acted according to their lights at the time, they would, if living, now have yielded obedience to the authority of the Church. "Even admitting," said he, "the sanctity of your fathers, how can you prefer to the Church, spread over the whole earth, this handful of saints in one corner of a remote island?"[1]

---

[1] *Eddius*, c. 10.

[2] *Bede*, l. c. (Tr.)

Wilfrid, in the excessive advocacy of his cause, appealed to the teachings of Holy Writ, and asserted that the present rule had been introduced by St. Peter, both of which assertions are entirely destitute of any foundation. The practice of the Holy See, as he said, was decisive of the question, and he should have rested there. He brought forward the true and insuperable argument at the close of his speech, when he appealed to the authority of the Apostolic See. "However holy or powerful," said he, "Columba may have been by his virtues, can we place him before the chief of Apostles, to whom our Lord himself said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven.'"[1] The king was struck by the force of the argument which placed his choice between the authority of Columba and that of the Prince of the Apostles; and Colman having confessed that he admitted the authority of Peter, and could produce no such sanction for the authority of Columba, the king cried out: "I say, like you, that he is the porter of Heaven, and that I will not oppose him, but, on the contrary, obey him in all things, lest, when I come to the doors of the heavenly kingdom, there be none to open them to me, if I am at variance with him who carries the keys. In all my life I will neither do nor approve anything or any person that may be contrary to him."[2]

When the king had brought his speech to a close, a vote was taken, and the whole assembly expressed their desire to follow the Roman rule. The other questions in dispute did not come up for discussion, as they were regarded as dependent on the issue of the main question. Hence those who adopted the Roman rule, accepted also the Roman tonsure.

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 25. (Tr.)

[2] *Eddius*, c. 10. *Bede*, l. c. (Tr.)

Bishop Colman, however, refused to give up the traditions of his ancestors, and in the year 664 resigned the bishopric of Lindisfarne, and, carrying with him the bones of Bishop Aïdan, the founder of the monastery, retired, with those who shared his opinions, to the monastery of Iona.[1] As *Tuda* and *Ceadda*, his successors in the see of Lindisfarne, adopted the Roman Easter, Iona, the Pictish nation, and the north of Ireland, were the only places that still held out and refused to give up the traditions of St. Columba. But *Adamnan*, the biographer of this saint, whose countryman he was, having become abbot of Iona in the year 679, labored strenuously to induce the monks to forsake their error. His efforts, however, were unavailing, and, passing over to Ireland, where he died in either 704 or 705, he succeeded in bringing back the people of that country, who still celebrated Easter according to ancient computation, except a few who were under the immediate influence of Iona, to the Roman rule.

The Picts, yielding to the energy and persuasions of their king, *Nechtan*, and to the arguments of the abbot *Ceolfrid*, who had been trained in the school of St. Wilfrid, gave up their error about the year 710.[2] The monastery of Iona still held out, but what *Adamnan*, their own countryman, was unable to effect, was accomplished by *Egbert*, who, though an Anglo-Saxon, had resided many years in Ireland. He was gentle in disposition, suave in manner, and of remarkable holiness of life. He accomplished by sweetness and kindness, a task in which Adamnan had failed, and having, in the year 716, prevailed upon the sons of St. Columba to accept the Roman rule, he passed out of this world, thirteen years later, on Easter Sunday, the very feast which he had labored so strenuously and effectually to establish among his sons of Iona.[1] He went to enjoy his Easter in heaven.

---

[1] *Bede*, III. 26. (Tr.)

[2] *Bede*, Hist. Eccl. V. 21. (Tr.)

It is true, the Britons of Cambria still clung to their old traditions, notwithstanding the many efforts of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries to bring them into harmony with the rest of the Church. But this obstinacy should be attributed to a jealousy of their Anglo-Saxon conquerors, whom they hated with an inveterate hate, which did not cease even after they had renounced their errors, rather than to any schismatical leaning. After considerable resistance, *Elbod*, bishop of Bangor, and a Briton by birth (A. D. 770), induced his countrymen to lay aside their ancient practice and accept the rule of the universal Church, and toward the close of the eighth century was equally successful with the inhabitants of South Cambria.[2]

Such was the termination of the controversy which had so long disturbed the peace of the Church in the British islands—a controversy which, though it excited many passions and was maintained with bitterness and obstinacy, can not be said to have originated from any spirit of schism or dislike toward Rome. We have seen all along how close a connection was maintained between Rome and both the contending parties; how each appealed to the authority of the Apostolic See and accepted its decision; how the Irish, in obedience to the instructions of Pope Honorius I., set about correcting their calendar; and how the king and Bishop Colman admitted the authority of the Roman rule, and accepted it as decisive of the Easter question.

The Cambrians, away off in a distant corner of Britain, had no opportunity of communicating with the Holy See, and hence some modern writers, such as Gieseler and others, have sought to account for this by asserting that they did not acknowledge its authority. But their efforts have utterly failed.[3]

---

[1] *Bede*, V. 22.

[2] Anno DCCLXX. Pascha mutatur apud Britones, emendante Elbod, homine Dei. *Ann. Eccl. Menevensis*, in *Anglia Sacra*, Vol. II., p. 648.

[3] An effort has been made by *Gieseler* to prove that the principal point of controversy between the Britons and St. Augustine arose from the fact, that the

§ 157. *Christianity in Germany and the Adjacent Countries.*

†*Hansizii*, S. J., Germania sacra, T. I. (Metropol. Laureacens. cum Episcopat. Pataviensi.) T. II. (Archiepisc. Salisb.) T. III. Prodromus (Archiepisc. Ratisbon.) Augustae Vindelicor. 1729 et Viennae, 1755. *Sig. Calles*, S. J., Annales eccl. Germ. (T. I., II. Viennae, 1756 sq. 6 T. fol.) *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II. (to 814); giving the *special Literature on the particular bishoprics*. †**Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II., p. 392–666. †*Hefele*, Hist. of the Introduction of Christianity into Southwestern Germany, Tübg. 1837. †*Hiemer*, Introd. of Christ. into the German countries, I., II., Schaffh. 1858. Tr.'s Add.: *Heber*, The Ante-Carlovingian Heroes of the Faith on the Rhine, Frkft. 1858, 2d ed. Götting. *Rudhart*, The most ancient Hist. of Bavaria, Hambg. 1841. **Ozanam*, Establishment of Christ. in Germ., transl. from the French into German, Munich, 1845. **Seiters*, St. Boniface the Apostle of the Germans, Mentz, 1845.

While the Germans, who had settled within the borders of the Roman Empire, and who had long since been converted

---

former did not recognize the supremacy of the Pope. He adduces, in proof of the statement, a document written in the British language, and brought to light by Spelman, in which *Dinoth*, abbot of Bangor, is represented as declaring to St. Augustine that the Pope is not Supreme Ruler of the Church.

Döllinger has shown that this document is of a later date than that ascribed to it, and that it bears intrinsic evidence of being a forgery. His chief arguments are: 1. Augustine could not have been acquainted with the British tongue, and hence Dinoth could not have made the alleged declaration to him. 2. The language of this pretended ancient document is *modern*, and contains an Anglo-Saxon word. This has been proved by many English scholars, and Spelman, who discovered it, admits that the manuscript is modern, but thinks it possible that it might have been copied from one of early date. 3. It contains an anachronism. Bishop of *Cäerleon*, on the Osca, is represented as metropolitan of the British church, whereas the bishop of *Menevia* had long before been raised to that dignity. 4. It is certain that British churchmen acknowledged the Supremacy of Rome, for *Gildas* says that many of them, when contending for ecclesiastical preferments, referred their quarrels to Rome for arbitration. "Etenim eos," he says, "si in parochia nonnullis resistentibus sibi et tam pretiosum quaestum severe denegantibus commessoribus, hujusmodi margaritam invenire non possint, praemissis ante sollicitè nuntiis, transnavigare maria, terrasque spatiosas transmeare non tam piget quam delectat, ut omnino talis species . . . comparetur. Deinde, cum magno apparatu magnaque phantasia, vel potius insania, repedantes ad patriam . . . violenter manus . . . sacrosanctis Christi sacrificiis extensuri." Gildae Epist., p. 24. See *Döllinger*, Ch. H. English trans., Vol. II., p. 61 et seq. "It may be said to have been annihilated," says *Count Montalembert*, "by the two memoirs of *M. Varin*, On the Causes of the *Dissension between the British and the Roman Church*, published by the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, 1858." Monks of the West, Vol. II., p. 175, note. (Tr.)

to Christianity, were enjoying its blessings and consolations, those who inhabited the country beyond these limits, and who were destined, during the present period, to play so important a part in the history of the Church, were still shrouded in the darkness of Paganism. It was with extreme difficulty that the new faith forced its way into the countries beyond the Danube and the Rhine, where the German tribes, which had not yet come into contact with the superior civilization of southern and western nations, were still attached to the traditions and customs of their ancestors. The difficulties which missionaries had here to encounter and overcome, before any measure of success could attend upon their labors, were of a character peculiar to the people, and more numerous and appalling than those of any other nation. Among these were the deadly feuds and hereditary hatred of the various tribes; the apprehension, not unfrequently well founded, that foreign missionaries might disguise hostile intentions under pretense of a holy zeal; their aversion to everything Roman—a name which they associated with all that is vile and base; and finally, their peculiar notions of morality and personal liberty. They carried their notions of personal liberty to such a length that they esteemed the privilege of bearing arms the most sacred of human rights, and felt bound, as a matter of honor, to take a bloody revenge on any one who should give them offense. Hence they could not comprehend and fully appreciate how one who suffered patiently, and met death willingly and without resistance, could become the Savior of mankind. The conversion of Germany was, therefore, a labor requiring time and patience, accompanied with many difficulties and doubtful struggles, and was not brought to a successful issue till near the close of the eighth century. It is more than likely, too, that policy was no inconsiderable motive with the Germans in taking this step; and it must be confessed that the interference of the Merovingian, and, notably, of the Carlovingian princes, in the work of conversion, was, according to our notions at least, violent and unwarranted. The Germans received the knowledge of Christianity from various sources. The first seeds of Gospel truth were sown in German soil by *Irish* and *Scotch* missionaries; and, side by side with them, the Frankish missionaries labored successfully to spread the faith in Bavaria. But the *Anglo-Saxons* were the true apostles of Germany; and among these, *St. Boniface* is, beyond all comparison, the most distinguished, and is justly called the Father of the Church in Germany. The individual efforts of these men were, after all, no more than a commencement. They, indeed, laid the foundation deep and wide, but the work of completing the superstructure was reserved to Charlemagne, through whose exertions the Church in Germany was placed upon a permanent basis. This victory over Paganism was not, however, achieved without a certain measure of violence and the shedding of blood.[1]

Christianity had been introduced into the countries along the Danube, such as Helvetia, Rhaetia, Vindelicia, and Noricum, as early as the second and third centuries, as well as into those bordering on the Rhine, where the Church had already reached a certain degree of prosperity; and also into the districts of Upper and Lower Germany.[2] But the wars, consequent upon the migration of nations, which, toward the close of the fourth century, desolated these countries, swept away, in their destructive course, cities and churches and people; and if Christians here and there escaped the violence of these ravages, and survived the evils of the times, no record of their history has come down to us. Hence the only authentic monuments of the early history of Christianity in Germany are confined to scattered and scanty allusions in the lives of her saints, and to the subscriptions of her bishops to the acts of councils.

No full, satisfactory, and precise account of the conversion of the German people exists of a date anterior to the seventh century.[3] While these countries were in a state of anarchy and seemingly hopeless confusion, our Divine Savior, *Jesus Christ, who ever watches with providential care over the destinies of*

---

[1] This Introd. to the Early Hist. of the Church is taken substantially from *Kraus'* Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 222. (Tr.)

[2] See Vol. I., p. 250 sq.

[3] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 72. (Tr.)

His Charch, had so ordained that Christianity should be introduced into *Ireland* and *Britain*, where it spread with remarkable rapidity, and attained a strong and vigorous development, to the end that Christian missionaries might, *in their turn*, go forth from these peaceful shores for the twofold purpose of carrying the light of faith into the wilds of Germany and restoring the Church of France to her former glory.[1]

As was fitting, most of these devoted missionaries directed their steps to *Rome*, before beginning their labors, to secure the requisite authority and obtain the apostolic blessing upon their work. By thus placing themselves under the immediate authority of the Holy See, they secured the double advantage of an apostolic commission and an intimate union with the Head of the Church, which was a source of comfort and hope when their energies flagged or mishaps came upon them.

Although the bishopric of *Vindonissa*,[2] in Helvetia, had existed from the earliest times, no account has reached us of those bishops who filled the see previously to the time of *Bubulcus*, who was present at the synod of *Epaon*, held A. D. 517. He was succeeded by one *Grammaticus*, whose name is found among those who attended the council of *Auvergne*, held A. D. 535, and the two councils of *Orleans*, held respectively A. D. 541 and 549. *Maximus*, his successor, transferred the see to *Constance*, a change which was of immeasurable advantage to *Alemannia*, as it was the means of effecting the conversion of the entire people.

In the year 630, the Frankish king *Dagobert I.* extended the boundaries of this diocese so as to include the cities of Strasburg, Basle, Augsburg, Lausanne, and Coire.[3]

There were also bishoprics at *Aventicum*[4] and *Geneva*, at *Octodurum*,[5] in the Valais; at *Coire*, in Rhaetia, and at *Basle;* but these were mostly destroyed during the migrations of the

---

[1] † The Irish Missionaries in Germany (*Bonn Periodical*, New Series, year IV., n. 1, pp. 19–56; n. 3, pp. 28–48).

[2] Windisch, in the Canton of Argovia. (Tr.)

[3] *Neugart*, Episcopat. Constant., St. Blasii, 1803, T. I., Freiburg, 1861; T. II., ed. Mone; *Eichhorn*, Episcopat. Curiensis, St. Blas. 1799; *Friedrich*, Vol. II., p. 439 et sq.

[4] Avenche, near Bern, afterward transferred to *Lausanne*.

[5] From the year 584, called Sitten.

Huns and *Alemanni*, who settled about these cities and in the adjacent territories.[1]

It would seem to be established, beyond all reasonable doubt, by the authority of several legends of saints and certain sepulchral inscriptions, that the *Alemanni* of Southwestern Germany,[2] who dwelt in the countries of Alsatia, Switzerland, Brisgovia, and Würtemburg, had received a knowledge of Christianity as early as the times of the Romans.

After the battle of Zulpich (A. D. 496), the Alemanni became subject to the king of the Franks, a circumstance which contributed materially to bring about their conversion. The *Alemannian Law*, enacted by Theoderic in the year 511, produced a salutary influence in the same direction. Its rigorous injunctions with regard to morality were in harmony with the teaching of the Gospel, and conduced to the formation of Christian habits and conduct among the people.[3] Finally, the translation of the episcopal see from Vindonissa to Constance, a city situated in the very center of the countries occupied by the Alemanni, was, as we have stated, an event, the importance of which can not be overrated in taking into account all the circumstances that contributed to the conversion of this people. Missionaries began now to come in from the distant shores of Ireland and Scotland; for it is a noticeable fact that these early pioneers of the faith were, without exception, either Irish or Scotch.

The first of those apostolic men to appear in Germany was *Fridolin*, an Irishman by birth, who had already spent many years of his laborious life at Poitiers, near the tomb of *St. Hilary*, whose virtues he admired, and for whom he had a very special devotion. In the year 511, he arrived on the banks of the upper Rhine, and founded at Säckingen, a town situated on an island of that river, above Basle,[4] a nunnery and a monastery of monks. He issued forth from this retreat to preach the Gospel to the inhabitants of both banks of the river.

---

[1] †*Scheerer*, Swiss Heroes and Heroines of the Christian Faith, Schaffh. 1857; †**Lütoff*, Apostles of Switzerland before St. Gall, Luzerne, 1871, 2 vols. *Gelpke*, Ch. H. of Switzerland, Bern, 1856 (see *Tübg. Quart.* 1859, p. 465–471).

[2] *Agathias*, Hist. ed Bonn. *Columbani* opp. Bibl. max. PP. XII. *Jonae* vita S. Columb. by *Mabillon*, Act. Bened. saec. II., P. 1. Vita S. Galli, *Pertz*, II. 1.

[3] *Hefele*, l. c., p. 211–240. *Friedrich*, Vol. II., p. 490 et sq.

[4] The oldest biography of St. Fridolin is to be found in the *Mone* Collection

St. Trudpert evangelized that part of the country of *Breisgau* lying to the south of Freiburg and extending to the north as far as Schutern; but he was, unfortunately, murdered by a slothful and treacherous servant, while resting from his arduous labors († A. D. 643).

St. Columbanus, a native of Ireland, was born in the year 543. He had been early instructed in literature and the liberal arts, and, possessing a handsome person and strong passions, was subject to many temptations, which he set himself resolutely to overcome. He at first intended to remain in his own country, and, in the hope of subduing the incessant solicitations of the flesh, applied himself to the study of Holy Scripture. But it was all in vain; and he determined, notwithstanding the tears and entreaties of his mother, to leave the country he loved so well. He went thence to the monastery of Bangor, where he spent many years under the abbot Cungall. Some time before the year 590, he and twelve companions were sent into Gaul, where, owing to the fury of war and the negligence of bishops, ecclesiastical discipline had become greatly relaxed, and Christian morality almost unknown. He went up and down the country, for several years, preaching the Gospel and leading both clergy and laity back to the practices of Christian virtue, of which he gave so many examples in his own life.

King *Gontran*, one of the grandsons of *Clovis*, fearing that Columbanus might be tempted to leave the country, offered him a place of residence if he would consent to remain. Columbanus, yielding to the royal wish, selected as the place of abode for himself and his numerous following of disciples, the ancient Roman castle of *Annegray*, where he lived for entire weeks without other food than the grass of the fields, the bark of the trees, and the berries which the neighboring

---

of the sources of the Hist. of Baden, Carlsruhe, 1848, Vol. I. *Schaubinger*, Hist. of the Monastery of Säckingen, and of St. Fridolin, Our Lady of Hermits, 1852. *Friedrich*, Vol. II., p. 411-439.

wood supplied. But his disciples increased so rapidly, that, in a few years, he was obliged to look about for a larger residence. Gontran then presented him with another strong castle, named *Luxeuil,* in the Vogese mountains, at the northern extremity of the kingdom of Burgundy.

Thierry governed Burgundy at this time, and with him resided his grandmother *Brunehault,* who, though far advanced in age, still loved power and authority, and, fearing that if her grandson should marry, she should no longer retain her influence, advised him to keep concubines instead of entering into lawful wedlock. St. Columbanus reproached both her and Thierry with the freedom and boldness characteristic of apostolic men, for this shameful conduct. He thus drew upon himself the anger of Brunehault, who ever afterward pursued him with inveterate hostility. At her instigation, Thierry expelled the abbot from Luxeuil, A. D. 610, and had him conducted to Besançon. But escaping the vigilance of his guards, Columbanus returned to Luxeuil, whence he was again expelled and conducted to Besançon, thence to Orleans and Nantes, where he was finally put on board a vessel, with orders to return to his own country. The vessel, however, having been driven back by contrary winds, went ashore, and remained on the beach for three successive days; and at the end of this time, Columbanus and his companions were permitted to disembark, and go whither they listed. Columbanus returned through Gaul to the kingdom of Austrasia, where he was well received by *Theodebert,* who was at that time engaged in a war against his brother Thierry. After preaching the Gospel for some time to the Pagan inhabitants of this kingdom, he ascended the Rhine from a point below Mayence, till he reached the lake of Zurich, made a short stay at *Thurgau* and *Arbon,* and finally established himself at *Bregenz,* on the lake of Constance. His chief assistant in these missionary labors was another Irishman by the name of *Gall,* as daring and resolute as Columbanus himself, well educated and eloquent, and able to preach in the German as well as in the Latin language.

By the battle of *Tolbiac* (A. D. 612), where his grandfather Clovis gained the important victory over the Alemanni over a century before, Theodebert lost his kingdom of Austrasia. As the country in which Columbanus had taken refuge, fell by this battle into the hands of his enemy, Thierry, he resolved to leave this new field of labor, and cross the Alps, into the kingdom of the Lombards. His companion Gall remained in Helvetia, continued his apostolic labors, and founded there one of the most celebrated monasteries in Christendom.

Having crossed the Alps with only one companion, Columbanus was well received by *Agilulf*, the Lombard king, who bestowed upon him a territory called *Bobbio*, situated in a gorge of the Apennines, between Genoa and Milan. There was an old church in this territory dedicated to St. Peter, but very much out of repair. Columbanus, notwithstanding his age and infirmities, set to work to repair it, and erect a monastery by its side. But not satisfied with the solitude which this retired spot afforded, he transformed a cavern in the side of a great rock, on the opposite shore of the *Trebbia*, into a chapel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and here he spent his last days in fasting and prayer. He died November 21, A. D. 615.

As has been stated, Gall, the companion and disciple of St. Columbanus, did not go with his master into Lombardy. He was stricken down with a fever, and having been restored to health through the tender care of *Willimar* of Arbon, he laid the foundations of the celebrated monastery of *St. Gall*, at a short distance from the spot where the Rhine falls into the lake of Constance, in the small and secluded valley where the torrent of Steinach makes its way among a bed of rocks. He was assisted in the foundation of this monastery, which was destined to exercise so beneficial an influence throughout Helvetia, by Gunzo, Duke of Ueberlingen, whose daughter, *Friedeburga*, he had freed from the possession of a demon. This princess, who was singularly beautiful, though affianced to Sigebert, the eldest son of Thierry II., withdrew to the Church of St. Stephen, and there clinging to the altar, and covered with a nun's veil, declared, in presence of her betrothed, her intention of dedicating her virginity to God. The prince generously waived his claim, saying: "I yield thee to my Lord Jesus Christ, the bridegroom whom thou preferrest to me."

Gall refused the bishopric of Constance, which the Duke Gunzo pressed upon his acceptance. He also refused the prayer of a deputation of Irish monks from Luxeuil, who, in the year 625, on the death of Eustace, requested him to become abbot of that great monastery; because, as he said, he was a stranger to them, and if he accepted their offer, he should be obliged to forsake the Alemanni, who were as yet Pagans, or only partially converted.

He continued to preach the Gospel to the inhabitants of the country about the monastery of St. Gall, and at the time of his death, which occurred at Arbon, October 16, A. D. 646, when he was in the ninety-fifth year of his age, the entire country of the Alemanni had become a Christian province.[1]

Still later on, St. Pirminius founded the famous monastery of *Reichenau* (Augia Dives), on an island in the lake of Constance[2] (A. D. 720). *St. Boniface* completed the conversion of the inhabitants of these districts. For centuries after their foundation, both St. Gall and Reichenau continued to be nurseries of art, learning, and piety, and from their cloisters numbers of bishops and ecclesiastics went forth to teach and govern the Church. The names of *Hatto* (afterward Bishop of Basle), *Reginbert*, *Waldfried Strabo*, *Herman the Contracted*, and others equally illustrious, shed a halo of enduring luster about these monasteries.[3]

Churches had also been established at a very early period in many of the municipal cities of Austria and Bavaria, such as *Salzburg* (Juvavia), *Passau* (Castra Batava), *Lorch* (Laureacum), *Ratisbon* (Reginum), *Petau* in Styria (Petavium), *Sabionae* (Säben-Brixen), and *Trent;* but these were all either entirely destroyed or defaced, and plundered, during the incursions of the Barbarians.

---

[1] His oldest Biography, ed. by *Jld. v. Arx*, in Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae, T. II., and most recently by *Meyer v. Knonau;* treated by *Waldfried Strabo*, vita St. Gall. (*Mabillon*, acta SS. ord. St. Bened. saec. II. and *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 114); the discourse of St. Gall, delivered at Constance, at the consecration of John, in *Galland.* bibl. T. XII., p. 751; on the fluctuations of writers in fixing the year of his death, conf. *Hefele*, p. 296–304. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., p. 46 sq. *Jld. v. Arx*, Hist. of the Canton St. Gall, ibid. p. 810–813, in 3 vols.; (Bp. *Greith*) St. Gall, the Apostle of the Alemanni, St. Gall, 1864. By the *same*, The Old Irish Church, Freibg. 1867, p. 271 sq.

[2] On the lake of Zill, according to *Kraus*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 223. (Tr.)

[3] The vita St. Pirmini in *Mone*, l. c., Vol. I.; *Schönhuth*, Chronicle of the former Monastery of Reichenau, Freib. 1836. *Staiger*, The island of Reichenau, with its Imperial Abbey, Constance, 1860. *Koenig*, Walafried Strabo (Freibg. Diocesan Archives, Vol. III., year 1868).

St. Valentine, a Belgian by birth, having first gone to Rome and obtained the apostolic sanction, began, about the year 440, to preach the gospel to the inhabitants of Passau, composed partly of Pagans and partly of Christians who had fallen into the Arian heresy. Unable to overcome the enmity of both of these classes, he was forced to withdraw from their territory, and to give up, for the present, all hope of their conversion. He again went to Rome, where he was consecrated bishop by the Pope, with instructions that, if he should be unable to return to Passau, he might preach the Gospel to the inhabitants of any other province accessible to him. He is on this accouunt surnamed *Regionarius*. He again made his appearance at Passau; but, having been treated with great cruelty and expelled the city, he directed his steps toward the highlands of the Rhaetian Alps, and, near the town of Meran, in the Tyrol, converted many to Christianity. He died full of merit, and went to receive the crown of his labors, in the year 470.[1]

Toward the close of the sixth century, *Ingenuinus* of Sabionae carried the light of faith into the countries lying still farther to the north.

St. Severin made his appearance in Pannonia and Noricum almost contemporaneously with St. Valentine, and by his presence brought hope and comfort to the harassed and scattered Christians of these countries. This wonderful and self-denying apostle had acquired so great a reputation for holiness of life that he commanded the respect and reverence of the Barbarians themselves, and by his miracles and prophecies inspired in the inhabitants of the country about *Passau* and *Fabiana* (Vienna), the theater of his labors, an abiding belief in the power of an overruling Providence. *Odoacer*, the leader of the Heruli, learned from the words of the Saint that he should one day reign upon the throne of the Caesars, and *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths, on his way through the country, turned aside from his direct route, to implore the blessing of this man of God. St. Severin died A. D. 482.

---

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 77 et sq. (Tr.)

The bishoprics of Salzburg, Ratisbon, and Lorch were among those which suffered most from the incursions of the Barbarians.

The Frankish missionaries appear to have been the first to announce the Gospel to the *Bojoari*, or Bavarians, who had settled in *Noricum* and *Vindelicia*.[1] At the close of the sixth century, their chief, *Garibald*, the father of Theodolinde, had already become a Christian. About the year 580, his relative, Theodo the Elder, also a Bavarian chief, while both he and his people were yet Pagans, invited *Rupert*, bishop of Wormatia (Worms), to his court at Ratisbon. When the holy bishop had arrived, he commenced to preach the Gospel, and had shortly the happiness of receiving into the Church the duke, with many of his nobles and people. At Juvavia, which was again revived under the name of Salzburg, Rupert built a church dedicated to St. Peter, to which he afterward added a monastery, and by this means secured the permanency of the infant Church.[2] But, notwithstanding the labors of these missionaries, *Emmeram* of Poitiers, who had formerly been a chorepiscopus, must be regarded as the true apostle of Bavaria. Having started from his home, in the year 652, with the purpose of preaching the Gospel to the Avari, the Pagan inhabitants of Pannonia, he arrived, in the course of his journey, at Ratisbon, where the duke Theodo was then residing. The duke besought the missionary, instead of proceeding further, to undertake the labor of instructing the inhabitants of Bavaria, some of whom had but lately embraced the faith, while others still refused to give up the errors of Paganism. After *three* years[1] of unceasing toil, the holy bishop resolved upon making a pilgrimage to Rome; but, before setting out, he made an effort to reclaim *Ota*, the daughter of the duke, from a life of shame. These kind offices brought upon himself the anger of her in whose behalf they were tendered. Ota represented to her brother, Landpert, that she had become pregnant by the bishop, and this information so incensed the young prince that he took a bloody vengeance upon the supposed author of his sister's shame.[2] But, his innocence having been clearly established, his body was at once brought back to Ratisbon and placed in a monastery founded in his honor and bearing his name.

---

[1] Monumenta Boica, Monac. 1769–1861, in 37 vols. *Rudhart*, Most ancient Hist. of Bavaria. Hambg. 1841; *Contzen*, Hist. of Bavaria, Münster, 1853, with copious Literature. *Schuegraf*, Hist. of the Cathedral of Ratisbon, 2 Pts., Ratisbon, 1848. *Niedermayer*, Monasticism in Bajuvaria, Landshut, 1859.

[2] St. *Rupert*, according to the Salzburg tradition, came to Bavaria in the first half of the sixth century. Since the times of **Mabillon* and **Hansiz*, it is generally assumed that he came to Ratisbon in 696, on the invitation of Duke Theodo II., in the second year of the reign (695–711) of King Childebert III., and that he died between 705–710; according to others, 718. *Koch-Sternfeld* (On the True Age in which St. Rupert lived, 1850,) and **Friedrich* (The True Age of St. Rupert, Bambg. 1866) have lately defended the tradition. But *Gfrörer* (Hist. of the Religion of the People, I., p. 280 sq.) and *Wattenbach* have taken sides with Mabillon. *Gfrörer* has adduced good reasons for his view, that Rupert—who, after Pepin's death (714), on a sudden left Bavaria (716), and returned to Worms, where he died—had been forced by the Majordomus upon the Bavarian duke. Conf. *Kraus*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 224. (Tr.) There is a full account of this controversy in *Möhler's* Ch. H., ed. by *Gams*, Vol. II., p. 60–67. *Zeissberg*, Arno, First Archbishop of Salzburg (785-821), Vienna, 1863.

The Frankish monk *Corbinian* founded the church of Freisingen, and became its first bishop. He died A. D. 730.[3]

St. Boniface completed the conversion of Bavaria, and introduced into the Church of that country a permanent ecclesiastical organization.

After the erection of the kingdom of Thuringia by the Franks, in the year 527, the seeds of the Gospel were sown in the country now known as *Franconia*,[1] by the Irish missionary, Bishop *Kilian* (Kyllena) and his companions, the priest *Coloman* and the deacon *Totnan*. Duke Guzbert and his retainers embraced the faith at Würzburg; but Kilian, like another St. John the Baptist, having courageously rebuked the duke for incestuous intercourse with Geilana, his brother's widow, so incensed this woman against him that she contrived the death of both him and his two companions (A. D. 689). Between this time and the year 742, when St. Boniface erected the see of Würtzburg, nearly every vestige of Christianity disappeared from the land.

---

[1] According to *Kraus*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 224, and *Döllinger*, l. c., p. 80. (Tr.)

[2] Vita St. Emmerani episcopi Frisingens. auctore *Aribone* in Bolland. acta SS. mens. Sept., T. VI., p. 474–486; *Arnolfus Vohburg*, de miraculis beati Emmerani libb. II. (*Canisius-Basnage*, l. c., T. III., Pt. 1, p. 105 sq.) in *Pertz*, monum. Germ., T. IV., p. 543–574. Conf. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II. *Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II.

[3] *Aribo* (fourth bp. of Freisingen, 764–784), vita St. Corbiniani (*Bolland.* acta SS. d. 8. m. Sept.); according to these and other sources: *Sulzbeck*, Life of St. Corbinian, Ratisbon, 1843.

From the fourth century onward, there were many episcopal sees existing, and in a flourishing condition, on the banks of the Rhine; as, for example, those of *Cologne*, *Mentz*, *Worms*, *Spire*, and *Strasburg*, then known as Argentoratum; on the banks of the Moselle and Meuse, those of *Treves*, *Metz*, *Toul*, and *Verdun;* and in Belgium, those of *Tongres*, which was transferred to Maestricht, A. D. 452; *Tournay* and *Arras*, the latter of which was, in 545, transferred to Cambrai.[2] All these suffered more or less from the incursions of the Barbarians, and some so severely that they ceased to exist.

About the year 600, St. Goar, a hermit of Aquitaine, in whose honor the monastery of St. Goar was built, set to work to restore Christianity along the banks of the Rhine, and achieved considerable success in his undertaking.

Between the years 623 and 663, Bishop *Cunibert*, whose efforts were ably seconded by King Dagobert I., labored with marked success at *Cologne*. In the reign of Charlemagne, this bishopric passed from the jurisdiction of Mentz, and was raised to the dignity of a metropolitan see.

In the year 630, *St. Amandus*, bishop of Strasburg, undertook the conversion of the Pagan inhabitants of Belgium; but, as they stubbornly and persistently repelled every attempt of the missionary, he had recourse to a more summary, if a less convincing method, and obtained from Dagobert I. a decree by which all were commanded to receive baptism and embrace the faith. But Amandus, wisely judging that no success could be permanent which was obtained by force, made no further use of the royal decree than to secure a respectful hearing; and, by dint of ceaseless toil, enduring patience, and indomitable perseverance, combated single-handed among the rude Barbarians till he finally, after having borne all manner of indignities and cruelties with heroic fortitude, overcame the most obstinate resistance, and converted to the true faith the inhabitants of the countries about Tournay and Ghent.

---

[1] *Sagittarii* antiquitates Gentilismi et Christianismi, Thuring. Jen. 1685, 4to. The vita St. Kiliani (*Canisius-Basnage*, l. c., T. III., Pt. 1, p. 163 sq.)

[2] For full details on all these bishoprics, see *Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II., p. 167–391. †*Geissel*, The Cathedral of Spire (surnamed the "Emperor's Dome"), being a topographical and historical monography, with two lithographies, 3 vols., Mentz, 1826 (containing also the hist. of the bishopric). *Remling*, The Bishops of Spire, Mentz, 1852. † *Werner*, The Cathedral of Mentz, together with the Hist. of the Bishops of Mentz, Mentz, 1827 sq., 3 vols.

In the year 646, he undertook, in obedience to the wish of King Siegbert II., the government of the diocese of Maestricht; but, disheartened by the opposition of his clergy, who refused to submit to the salutary discipline which he had introduced, he, three years later, requested permission from Pope Martin to resign his office. His request was at first denied. He then set out for Rome, where he was more successful. Leaving Rome, he visited other countries, and finally returned to the monastery of Elnon, near Tournay, where he died, A. D. 679 or 685.

St. Omer, or Audomar, by birth an Aleman, a contemporary of Amandus, preached the Gospel to the idolatrous Morini, many of whom he baptized, and founded among them the Abbey of St. Bertin. Contemporary with these two saints were *St. Livin*, an Irishman, who spread the faith among the *Brabantins*, by whom he was martyred (A. D. 656), and Bishop *Eligius* of Noyons, who had previously been a goldsmith.

§ 158. *Christianity among the Frisians—Reverses of the Christians in Spain.*

The work of converting this rude and savage people was attended with almost insuperable difficulties. It was first undertaken by the noble *Eligius*[1] († 659), and, later on, by the Anglo-Saxon *Wilfrid*, Bishop of York,[2] who, in one of his journeys to Rome, was carried to the north by an adverse wind, and landed on the shores of the low and marshy country of the Frisians, among whom, with the consent of their king, Adalgisus, he immediately commenced to preach the faith of Christ. He remained with them during the winter of 678–679, and was amply repaid for his toil; for, before his departure, he had the happiness of baptizing nearly all the chiefs and thousands of the people. This mission, however, became still more successful, after Pepin of Heristal had reduced the Frisians to the authority of the Frankish rule.

Willibrord,[3] an Anglo-Saxon priest, who had been educated in Ireland, assured of the protection of Pepin, was sent to labor as a missionary among the Frisians by Pope Sergius, in the year 692. He established the bishopric of *Utrecht* (Wiltaburg), and was consecrated bishop at Rome under the name of *Clement*. *Suidbert*, one of the most zealous and energetic of his fellow-laborers, preached the Gospel to the *Boructuarians*, who dwelt along the right bank of the Rhine. But being obliged to give up this mission when the country was invaded by the Saxons, he withdrew to an island in the Rhine, near Düsseldorf, presented to him by Pepin, and there founded the monastery *Kaiserswerth*. He died A. D. 713.

In the year 712, *Wulfram*, Archbishop of Sens, encouraged by the success which followed the labors of Willibrord, undertook the conversion of those portions of the territory of the Frisians that had not yet been subjected by the Franks. *Radbot*, their barbarous chief, having been informed, that, if he were fortunate enough to get to Heaven, "he should not enjoy the company of his Pagan fellow-countrymen," refused to receive baptism.[1]

---

[1] *Neander*, Memorab. III. 1, p. 108 sq. His biography by his scholar, Audoen (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg. T. II.)

[2] Vita St. Wilfridi ab Eddio conscript., c. 27. Conf. *Beda Venerab.* h. e. V. 10. *Eddius*, c. 25. (Tr.)

[3] Alcuin's Life of Willibrord in *Mabill.* acta SS. ord. St. Bened. saec. III., Pt. I., p. 601. *Beda*, l. c. V. 12. Conf. *Bolland.* acta SS. ad 1. m. Martii. *Alberd. Thijm*, Life of St. Willibrord, transl. from the Dutch into German, by *Tross*, Münster, 1864. Conf. *Tübg. Quart.* 1864, n. 2. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., p. 517.

Willibrord, who, though he labored with the zeal of a true apostle, and had already pushed his conquests as far as Denmark, did not succeed in bringing his work to a successful conclusion till after the death of this chief, which occurred in the year 719, when Charles Martel subdued the remaining portions of the Frisian territory heretofore independent of Frankish authority. This event facilitated the work of the missionaries, who shortly enjoyed the happiness of seeing all the Frisians pass into the one fold of Christ. Bishop Willibrord died A. D. 739.

Charles Martel also enjoys the honor of having, by his heroic bravery and dauntless courage, checked the rapid conquests and broken the menacing domination of Islamism.

The Arabs, inspired by a blind fanaticism, went on in a destructive career of conquest, till they finally subdued and took possession of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, and in the year 707, under the Ommaiades, of the northwestern provinces of Africa. The Crescent now seriously threatened Christian Europe. The sons of king *Witiza* (A. D. 701–710), after their father had been dethroned by a number of powerful and discontented nobles, and *Roderic* set up in his place, formed with their uncle, *Oppas*, Archbishop of Seville, Count Julian, whose family Roderic had dishonored by his dissoluteness, and their numerous partisans, a formidable coalition against the intruded prince, and, in order the better to carry out their designs, called to their aid the Arabs of Africa. Musa, the Saracen governor of Mauritania, readily acceded to their wishes, and sent into Spain an army of Arabs and Moors, under the command of Tarik, one of his ablest generals. Roderic collected all his available forces, and met the enemy at Xerez, in Andalusia, where he was completely defeated (A. D. 711). Musa, having shortly after arrived in Spain with fresh forces, took the command in person, and, dividing his army into three bodies, overran and subdued the whole country, with the exception of the northern provinces (A. D. 712–714).

---

[1] *Krauss* states (Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 226) that this assertion is probably an invention of some of the later Predestinarians.

Abderrhahman, the Viceroy of Spain, entertaining the idea of uniting both the East and the West under one government, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of the Arabs, and descended into the plains of Burgundy and Aquitaine. He had already subjugated the southern portions of France, and pushed his conquests as far north as the river Loire, when Charles Martel, who came up with the invader between Tours and Poitiers, totally defeated him in a pitched battle (A. D. 732), put an end to his victorious career, and dealt a deathblow to the power of the Arabs in France.

In Spain, those of the Christians who still continued to live among the Arabs, and hence called Mozarabians, or Mixed Arabs, were barely tolerated, always regarded with distrust, and compelled to submit to the most severe exactions.[1] Those Christians, on the contrary, who had retired into the mountains of Asturias and Biscay, early asserted their independence, and little by little founded commonwealths and kingdoms, which, at first, defied, and then gradually and successfully contested the Arab domination in Spain.

§ 159. *Labors of St. Boniface.*

Bonifacii epp. ed. *N. Serarius*, Mogunt. 1605 and 1609, max. bibl. T. XIII., p. 70 sq.; ed. *Würdtwein*, Mogunt. 1789 fol.; ed. *Giles*, Oxon. 1846, 2 T., very defective—as, likewise, in *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 89; now with greater critical accuracy—along with the vitae et passio Bonifacii, *Lulli* epp., and many other items, in **Jaffé*, monumenta Moguntina, Berol. 1866 (T. III. of the Bibl. rer. Germ.), letters, in German, with the Life of St. Boniface, Fulda, 1842; complete works transl. into German and illustrated, by *Külb*, Ratisbon, 1856, 2 vols. *Willibaldi* (about 783) et *Othlonii* vita St. Bonifacii (about 1100), (*Mabillon*, Acta SS. ord. St. Bened., T. II., III.; *Bollandi* Acta SS. m. Junii, T. I., p. 452 sq.; *Pertz*, Monum. T. II., p. 331 sq.) *Serarii* res Moguntiacae, Mogunt. 1604, ed. *Johannes*, Frcf. 1722. †**Seiters*, Boniface, Apostle of the Germans, Mentz, 1845. †*Reinerding*, St. Boniface, Würzbg. 1855. *Müller*, Bonifacius, eene kerk-historische studie, Amsterd. 1869 sq., 2 vols. See *Reusch's* Theological Journal of Literature, nro. 25, year 1870. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., p. 307–372. †*Binterim*, Hist. of Germ. Counc., Vol. II. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. III., p. 458–549. *Oelsner*, Annals of the Frankish Kingdom under Pepin, Lps. 1871.

The many and various efforts to introduce Christianity into

---

[1] *Aschbach*, Hist. of the Ommaiades in Spain, Frankfort, 1829, 2 vols.

Germany, and to establish it upon a permanent basis, would never have been crowned with complete success, had there not existed some common bond of union among the different churches scattered up and down the country, and some common center to give unity and system to individual exertion. To this end, God raised up a man, distinguished for force of character and gentleness of disposition, and remarkable for prudence and patient perseverance, who not only gave to the Church in Germany a complete organization and insured her permanence, by establishing the most intimate relations between her and the Supreme Head of Christendom, but also carried the light of the Gospel among those German tribes which had hitherto remained both Pagan and barbarous. This was the Anglo-Saxon priest *Winfried.* Born of respectable parents, at Kirton, in Devonshire, in the kingdom of Wessex, in the year 680 (685?), he was, from his tenderest years, drawn to a monastic life, and was educated and trained in spiritual life in the monasteries of *Exeter* and *Nutcell,* then the most flourishing of the monastic establishments of England. Feeling that it was his vocation to spend his life among Pagans, laboring for their conversion, he set out in the year 716 upon his first voyage as a missionary, and landed in the country of the *Frisians.* But war having broken out between King Radbot and Charles Martel, it became impossible for him to prosecute his designs, and he again crossed the sea, and returned to his monastery. Having, however, firmly resolved to spend his life as a missionary, laboring for the weal of others, he again crossed the channel in the year 718, and, following the example of so many of his Anglo-Saxon predecessors, set out for Rome, with letters of recommendation from Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, to obtain from Gregory II., the then reigning Pope, his authority[1] to preach the Gospel among the heathen. He gave the first proofs of his devotion to the Church and to the cause in which he was embarked, in *Thuringia;* but, after the death of Radbot, he returned to the *Frisians* (A. D. 719), and having placed himself under the authority of Willibrord, Bishop of Utrecht, set to work with enthusiastic zeal, and had the gratification of seeing his labors crowned with complete success. But as the Papal appointment indicated Germany as the theater of his labors, Winfried returned to *Hesse* and *Thuringia*, in 722, and, passing through Treves, turned aside from his direct route to visit *St. Adele*, at Pfalzel (Palatiolum), a short distance from that city, where he fell in with *Gregory*, a kinsman of the saint's, and a worthy descendant of King Dagobert III., whose services he secured for the Church. At *Amoeneburg*, in Upper Hesse, he received into the Church the princes Dierolf and Detdig, and founded a monastery on the banks of the Ohm, where he also baptized many thousands of the Pagan inhabitants.

---

[1] This authorization is given in *Würdtwein,* ep. 2, and in *Serarius,* ep. 118.

Having sent a report of his progress to Pope Gregory, he was called to Rome by that pontiff (A. D. 722), where, having made his Profession of Faith and taken the *oath of allegiance*[1] to the Roman Catholic Church, he was consecrated bishop of all the churches of Germany (episcopus regionarius), and provided with letters recommending him to the good offices of Charles Martel (A. D. 723). It was on this occasion that he received from the Pope the name of Boniface. Thus having received for his mission the sanction of the Apostolic See, and assured of the protection of Charles Martel, he commenced his labors, and in a short time succeeded in converting nearly all the inhabitants of *Hesse* and *Thuringia*.

---

[1] This oath, which is given in *Othlo*, lib. I., cap. 19, is similar to that taken by the suburbicarian bishops: "Promitto ego Bonifacius, Dei gratia Episcopus, tibi beate Petre, Apostolorum princeps, Vicarioque tuo beato Gregorio Papae, et successoribus ejus per P. et F. et Sp. St., Trinitatem inseparabilem, et hoc sacratissimum corpus tuum, me omnem fidem et puritatem sanctae fidei cathol. exhibere, et in unitate ejusdem fidei, Deo operante, persistere, in quo omnis christianorum salus esse sine dubio comprobatur, nullo modo me contra unitatem communis et universalis ecclesiae, suadente quopiam, consentire, sed, ut dixi, fidem et puritatem meam atque concursum tibi et utilitatibus tuae ecclesiae, cui a Domino Deo potestas ligandi solvendique data est, et praedicto Vicario tuo atque successoribus ejus per omnia exhibere. Sed et si cognovero Antistites contra instituta antiqua SS. Patrum conversari, cum eis nullam habere communionem aut conjunctionem; sed magis, si valuero prohibere, prohibebo; si minus, hoc fideliter statim domno meo Apostolico renuntiabo. Quod si, quod absit, contra hujus professionis meae seriem aliquid facere quolibet modo, seu ingenio, vel occasione tentavero, reus inveniar in aeterno judicio, ultionem Ananiae et Saphirae incurram, qui vobis etiam de rebus propriis fraudem facere praesumserunt. Hoc autem indiculum Sacramenti ego Bonifacius exiguus Episcopus manu propria scripsi, atque ponens supra sacratissimum corpus St. Petri, ita ut praescriptum, Deo teste et judice, feci sacramentum, quod et conservare promitto." This solemn engagement did not prevent Boniface from being fearless and outspoken when there was a proper occasion, or others from finding fault with what displeased them at Rome. Boniface, for example (Ep. 51. ad Zachar.), complains, that at Rome the ecclesiastical canons are not observed; that superstitious and sacrilegious practices are not suppressed; and affirms that such negligence cools the love and weakens the obedience due to the Apostolic See.

The "Thunder Oak of Geismar," near Fritzlar, had been long an object of religious reverence among the Germans, and was regarded as a symbol of their heathen worship, and an abiding evidence of their faith in their gods. They were appalled, when they beheld Boniface fearlessly attacking it and felling it to the ground, that Thor, to whom it was dedicated, did not avenge the insult; and, reasoning as rude and primitive people are apt to do, that a god who was helpless in his own defense, could scarcely be relied on by others, entirely gave up faith in the deities they had so long and so abjectly honored. Boniface constructed of the wood of this oak a chapel, which he dedicated to St. Peter. He made strenuous and assiduous efforts to efface every trace of Paganism, and combated the heretics *Adelbert* and *Clement*, who were engaged in spreading error and unbelief wherever an occasion offered. He gave his chief care to the establishment of monasteries,[1] that of *Ohrdruf* being one of his first foundations. As the labors of his new missions were daily increasing, he called upon his friends in England to come to his assistance, and of those who answered his call, *Burchard*, *Lullus*, *Willibald*, his brother *Wunibald*, and *Wita* are the best known. Many female religious also came over, among whom were the learned Cunigilde and her daughter Berathgit, Cunitrude, and Thecla, who belonged to the nunneries of Kitzingen and Ochsenfurt, on the Main; Lioba, who was at Bischofsheim, on the banks of the Tauber; and Walpurgis, at Heidenheim, in the Saulafield.[1]

---

[1] *Othlo*, l. c. I. 30; also in *Willibald*, c. 8, it is reported: Ex Britanniae partibus servorum Dei plurima ad eum tam lectorum quam etiam scriptorum (copyists) aliarumque artium eruditorum virorum congregationis convenerat multitudo.

In the year 731, he sent a messenger to Rome to signify his submission and allegiance to the new Pope, *Gregory III.*, the successor of Gregory II. The same messenger carried back to Boniface the *archiepiscopal pallium*, with instructions from the Pope to consecrate new bishops wherever the number of the faithful should have so increased as to require them.

Boniface, after having erected churches at *Fritzlar* and *Amoeneburg*, and made a pastoral visit through Bavaria, in the course of which he fell in with his excellent disciple, *Sturm*, journeyed to Rome for the *third time* (A. D. 738). Having returned from Rome invested with increased powers, he paid a second visit to Bavaria, in the year 739, and, at the request of Duke Odilo, completed the organization of the Church of that country, and established the *four bishoprics* of *Salzburg*, *Freisingen*, *Ratisbon*, and *Passau*. *Nivilo* was already the legally constituted bishop of Passau, and Boniface appointed to the other three sees occupants in every way worthy of their exalted dignity. He also created a fifth bishopric at *Eichstädt*, to which he appointed *Willibald*. The *Bavarian Synod*, convoked by Boniface in the year 740, contributed materially to strengthen this ecclesiastical organization.

Boniface now established bishoprics at *Würzburg*, in Franconia, at *Buraburg*, in Hesse, and at *Erfurt*, in Thuringia, to which he appointed respectively Burchard, Wita, and Adalar.

After the death of Charles Martel (A. D. 741), the administration of the kingdom devolved upon his two sons, Carloman and Pepin, under whom the Church increased in prosperity in Austrasia, Alemannia, and Franconia.

Archbishop Boniface, availing himself of this favorable state of affairs, and acting on the instructions of Pope Zachary, and at the request of Carloman, convoked, A. D. 742, the first so-called *German Synod*, at which seven canons were passed for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, which had been very much relaxed, particularly among priests, monks, and nuns, and for the suppression of Pagan practices. It was enacted that in future synods should be held annually. Hence we hear of a second one having been held in either the year 743 or 745, at *Liptinae* (Liftinae, Lestines, in Hainault), at which Boniface again endeavored, with characteristic energy, to provide measures for the suppression of Pagan practices, a long list of which is given in the profession of faith and formula of abjuration. This instrument prescribes "a renunciation of the gods Thunar and Wodan, of the Saxon god Odin, and of all sorcerers and their associates."[1]

---

[1] † *Zell*, Lioba and the pious Anglo-Saxon women, Freiburg, 1860.

Boniface also instructed the clergy to use the *German language* upon certain occasions; as, for example, in teaching the people particular prayers, in reading the epistles and Gospels, and in giving homilies on them, and in reciting such of the prayers belonging to the administration of the sacraments as are not deemed of essential importance.

So great was the influence and authority of Boniface, at this time, that Pepin requested him to restore faith and morality to the Church of *Neustria*, or the western kingdom of the Franks, where ecclesiastical discipline had been greatly relaxed and serious errors crept in. Boniface commenced his work by convoking the *Synod* of *Soissons* (A. D. 744), one of the canons of which prescribes that synods shall be annually held, that thus measures may be provided to secure the salvation of the people, and to prevent the rise of heresy. The reformation so auspiciously commenced was still further advanced by a general synod of the whole Frankish kingdom, in the year 745, but at what place is not known, which deposed *Gewilieb*, bishop of Mentz, because he had assassinated a Saxon,[2] and condemned *Clement* and *Adelbert* as heretics.

In the year 742, Boniface commenced a work which he had very much at heart, and in which he was ably seconded by *Sturm*, a young Baravian, whose education had been intrusted to him, and who was the most beloved of all his disciples. This was the erection of the monastery of Fulda, which, when completed, was placed under the charge of Sturm, and, like St. Gall and Reichenau, was for a long time the nursery in which the bishops of Germany were educated and trained, and the home of the arts and sciences. It was the custom of Boniface to visit this establishment yearly, and to spend here a few days of quiet and relaxation from his great labors.

---

[1] *Binterim*, German Councils, Vol. II., p. 17 et sq., and 117 et sq. *Hefele*, Vol. III., p. 464.

[2] *Gewilieb*, like Milo of Treves, was raised to the episcopal office and dignity, though he was but a rude soldier, and spent his days of leisure in following the chase. *Kraus*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 228.

Boniface clearly foresaw that the permanency and good order of these institutions required some central authority, and as he had already received the archiepiscopal pallium from the Pope, though he had not yet fixed upon a place of residence, he resolved to establish his metropolitan see at *Mentz*, rendered vacant by the deposition of Gewilieb. Had he not been called to this see by an assembly of the nation, he would very probably have fixed his residence at Cologne, which he much preferred to Mentz, on account of its proximity to his beloved Frisians. Pope Zachary confirmed this choice, and raised Mentz to metropolitan rank, with authority not alone over those sees established by Boniface himself, such as Würtzburg, Eichstädt, Buraburg, and Erfurt, but also over those of Utrecht, Tongres, Cologne, Worms, and Spire. But the sees of Buraburg and Erfurt did not retain long their importance, and finally became parts of the dioceses of Paderborn and Mentz; while Cologne, on the contrary, was raised to metropolitan rank, and Utrecht made suffragan to it.

Boniface, though giving much time and thought to the administration of these dioceses, and to the holding of councils,[1] did not neglect other affairs of importance. He clearly saw that bishops, to possess some sort of protection against the violence of kings and the insolence of nobles, should enjoy a certain political consideration and prerogatives which all would recognize and respect, and hence he exerted himself successfully to have them created spiritual *peers of the Empire.* Shortly after this event, Childeric III., the last of the worthless Merovingian kings, was deposed by an assembly of the nation, held at Soissons, and retired into a monastery. Pepin, who already possessed and exercised the power and authority, if he did not enjoy the title of king, was chosen to succeed him, and was consecrated by Boniface, who had been commissioned by the Pope to perform the office (A. D. 752).[1]

---

[1] Those at Düren, A. D. 747 and 748. It is also probable that the Synod of Cloveshove, in England, A. D. 747, was held at his suggestion.

Boniface was not indeed insensible that years of toil and hardship were beginning to tell upon him; but, for all that, he still possessed all the ardor and generous resolution of younger days, and now, in his old age, determined to carry out the vow he had made in his youth, of converting the Frisians to Christianity. For this purpose he sought and obtained permission from the Pope to resign his archiepiscopal see in favor of *Lullus*, one of his most distinguished disciples, and, in the year 755, set out on his journey to Friesland with the conviction strong upon him that he should never again return to the friends with whom he was parting. He was accompanied by *Eoban*, Bishop of Utrecht, three priests, three deacons, and four monks. They had already baptized many thousands of the Frisians and formed some Christian communities, when an end was put to their labors by the barbarity of some Pagan Frisians. Boniface had taken a position at Dokkum, beyond the Zuyder Zee, where he had made arrangements to administer the sacrament of confirmation, on the great feast of Pentecost, to those who had already been baptized. While waiting their coming, he and his companions, to the number of fifty-two, were surrounded and put to death by a band of unconverted Frisians (June 5, 755). Boniface had forbidden his followers to make any resistance, and all quietly awaited their fate, and went to obtain the martyr's crown. Boniface was in the seventy-fifth year of his age, and the greater part of his life had been spent in the service of Him to whom he gave this last and supreme token of his love.

The churches of Utrecht, Mentz, and Fulda disputed for the possession of the body of this glorious martyr, which, according to his own request, was buried in the monastery of Fulda, the most cherished of all his religious foundations.[1]

---

[1] It has, however, been conclusively proven that Boniface had nothing whatever to do in this matter. *Kraus*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 228. (Tr.)

The Roman name of *Bonifacius*, bestowed by the Pope upon the Anglo-Saxon, Winfried, at his consecration, has been one of incalculable import to Germany. The Protestant professor *Leo* has a very just remark relative to St. Boniface. "Boniface," says he, "has contributed incomparably more to intellectual development in Germany, and, as a consequence, to Germans, than any single one of all the later German kings."

The spirit of Boniface, which his disciples *Sturm*, abbot of Fulda; *Gregory*, abbot of Utrecht, and *Burkhard*, Bishop of Würzburg, had inherited, long continued to exercise a marked and beneficial influence upon the destinies of this great church.

§ 160. *The Conversion of the Saxons.*

Annales Guelferbytani (769–805) in *Pertz*, II. *Altfridi* vita Ludgeri, eppi. Memegardefordensis, †809. *Poëtae Saxonis*, Annales de gestis Karoli M. (771–814), *Einhardi* Annales. (Tr.)

Meinders, de statu rel. et reip. sub Carolo M. et Ludov. Pio in Saxon. Lemg. 1711, 4to. *Clavör*, Saxonia inferior antiqua, gentilis et christiana, i. e. Ancient, Pagan, and Christian Lower Saxony, etc., Goslar, 1714 fol. *Strunk*, S. S., Westphalia sacra, ed. *Giefers*, Paderborn, 1854 sq. *Zimmermann*, de mutata Saxonum religione, Darmst. 1839. † *Welter*, Introd. of Christianity into Westphalia, Münster, 1838. Monumenta Paderbornensia, etc. (by Liber Baro de *Fürstenberg*, Prince-Bishop there), Amst. 1672; in German, Denkmale des Landes Paderborn von Ferd. Freiherr von Fürstenberg, Paderborn, 1844. *Erhard*, Reg. hist. Westfal. Monast. 1847–1851. *Böttger*, Intr. of Christ. into Saxony, by Charlemagne, Hanover, 1859. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germ., Vol. II., p. 382–485. *Hiemer*, l. c., Vol. VI.

The *Saxons*, a brave and warlike people, possessing neither kings nor cities, and embracing the *Westphalians*, *Angles*, and *Eastphalians*, opposed a long and most determined resistance to Christianity. *Moreover, the means employed to effect their conversion retarded rather than accelerated it.* The first attempt to convert them was made, toward the close of the seventh century, by the two Anglo-Saxon brothers *Ewald*, surnamed the Black and the White. If they did not reap a harvest of souls as the fruit of their labors, they obtained for themselves the reward of the martyr's crown.

---

[1] Codex diplomaticus Fuldensis, ed. *Dronke*, Cassel, 1850, with Register by *Schminke*, Cassel, 1862. *G. Zimmermann*, de rerum Fuldensium primordiis dissertatio, Gissae, 1841. Cf. *Rettberg*, Vol. I., p. 370 sq. *Schwarz*, On the Foundation and Primordial History of the Monastery of Fulda, Programme of Fulda, 1856.

A doctrine which taught them to despise the world and its pleasures, and coming to them through the Frankish Empire, which they thoroughly hated, found but little favor among this rude and licentious people. However, the efforts of a few missionaries were crowned with partial success. Such were *St. Lebuin*, who died A. D. 773,[1] and *Gregory* of *Utrecht*, whose work was considerably facilitated by the victories of Pepin the Short, who conquered the Saxons in the year 753. But, as the Saxons still continued to make predatory incursions into the territories of the Empire of the Franks, the latter determined to complete their subjugation by force of arms. Sensible, however, that as long as this rude people remained attached to their errors, their promises of peace would be precarious and their acts of submission delusive, the Franks *forced them to profess Christianity and receive baptism.* After the year 772, when Charlemagne entered seriously upon the work of subjugating them, this policy was again taken up and prosecuted with renewed vigor. It was continued, without interruption and with untiring perseverance, for a period of thirty-three years, and was uniformly resisted with the most hearty and determined obstinacy.[2]

Charlemagne inaugurated this religious war by demolishing the *Irminsul*, or Column of Irmin,[3] in which Irmin was represented as sustaining the universe. The figure was likely meant to combine the idea of God, *one* and invisible, and the memory of the popular hero, *Herman*. Charlemagne, being possessed of an idea that he was an instrument in the hands of God, and had a duty to avenge the insults offered to His Church, refused to listen to the prudent counsel of his friend *Alcuin*, and of *Arno*, Archbishop of Salzburg, who told him that the "Saxons should be persuaded to enter the Church from motives of conviction, and not be forced to do so by violence," and that it would be more becoming in him "to conduct himself as an Apostle than as a gatherer of tithes." He refused to give up the policy he had adopted, but it is more than likely that his desire to rid himself of an implacable enemy and a dangerous neighbor may have given an impulse to religious zeal.

---

[1] Passio SS. Ewaldorum, auct. Beda Venerab. in h. e. Anglor. V. 10.—Vita St. Lebuini Frisor. et Westfal. apostoli auct. Huibaldo (anno 918–976). *Strunk-Giefers*, T. II., p. 19 sq. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., pp. 405, 536.

[2] *Funk*, On the Subjugation of the Saxons under Charlemagne. (*Schlosser*, Archives of Hist. and Lit. 1833, Vol. IV., p. 293 sq.) .*Justus Möser*, Hist. of Osnabrück, § 34, Vol. I., p. 198. Compare also *Leo*, Lectures on German History. He says: "Charles raged against Saxon Paganism, not because it was a religion altogether different from the Christian, but because it was associated with the most atrocious horrors, and because its followers were irreconcilable adversaries of the Frankish Empire." Vol. I., pp. 503, 498.

[3] *Jacob Grimm*, Jrmenstrasse and Jrmensäule; or, The Road and Pillar of Arminius, Vienna, 1815. *Hagen*, Irmin, Breslau, 1817, in *Clavör*, l. c. fol. 35

Some hopes were entertained of the conversion of the entire nation when the chiefs *Wittekind* and *Alboin*, after their defeat in 785, consented to receive baptism. But this hope, never very full of promise, vanished entirely after the year 793. The rule of the Franks was so harsh and oppressive, and the *ecclesiastical tithes collected* with such exactness and rigor, that the Saxons rose in open revolt, and put an end, for the time being, to all hopes of converting them to Christianity. Charles was under the impression that the tithes could not be remitted, because their payment was *prescribed by divine ordinance.*

But, in the year 805, when the Saxons were completely subdued, and submitted, once for all, to the rule of the Franks, there was a reasonable ground of hope that now, at least, the Church had obtained a solid and permanent footing in the north of Germany. But if Christianity finally secured a triumph, it was a triumph which cost many a bloody struggle and called forth all the genius and energy of Charlemagne.

It was amid such difficulties as these that churches were

---

sq. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., p. 385. *Hoelscher*, de Irmini Dei natura nominisque origine, Bonn, 1865. According to the Journal of the Westphalian Historical Society, Vol. VIII., the column of Irmin, destroyed by Charlemagne in 772, was no more than the trunk of a tree remaining of the sacred grove of Tanfana.

set up, monasteries and convents founded, and bishoprics established. Among the bishoprics were *Osnabrück,*[1] *Münster, Paderborn, Minden, Bremen, Verden, Halberstadt;*[2] to which may be added those that came into existence later on, under Louis le Debonnaire, as the bishopric of *Hildesheim*[3] and the important monastery of *Corvey*, on the banks of the Weser (a branch of the Frankish abbey of Corbie). This monastery effected a great work; for to the apostolic men who went forth from its cloisters is due the honor of having brought about the *true* and *interior* conversion of the rebellious and obstinate Saxons—the conversion of mind and heart, without which all professions are empty and delusive. The noble men engaged in this apostolic labor have all a place in history, but there is one who stands out with marked prominence above the rest. This is *Ludger*,[4] a Frisian by birth, but a disciple of Gregory of Utrecht and of Alcuin, who, from the year 787 till his death, which occurred A. D. 809, did not cease to labor with indefatigable zeal and heroic fortitude for the conversion of the Westphalians. He was the first bishop of *Mimigardeford* (Münster), and a judgment of his usefulness and his holiness of life may be had from the fact that his memory is still cherished with reverence among the inhabitants of this city. His tomb, in the Abbey of Verden, was the scene of many miracles, and was frequented by numbers of pilgrims.

The labors of *Willehad*, an Anglo-Saxon priest, were scarcely less conspicuous and fruitful. At the request of Charlemagne, and protected by his authority, Willehad established and organized the bishopric of *Bremen*. He died A. D. 789, and his biography was written by *St. Ansgar*, Archbishop of Hamburg,[5] to whom it was a work of love. The names of

---

[1] *Erdwini Erdmanni* Chronicon episcopor. Osnabrug. in *Meibom.* rerum Germanicar. scriptores, T. II. *Giefers*, Origin of the See of Paderborn; in the same place, 1860. *Bessen*, Hist. of the See of Paderborn; same place, 1820, 2 vols.

[2] Probably transferred from Heiligenstadt, also known as Osterwick.

[3] Conf. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. V., p. 190 sq.

[4] His Life, by *Alfridus*, second successor of St. Ludger, in the see of Münster, in *Pertz*, monumenta, T. II. *Behrends*, Life of St. Ludger, Apostle of the Saxons, 1843.

[5] In *Pertz*, Monumenta, T. II., p. 378 sq.

Viho, *Hadumar*, *Heribert*, and *Patto* (?), the first bishops of Osnabrück, Paderborn, Minden, and Verden, on the banks of the Aller,[1] are equally well and favorably known.

RETROSPECT.

It is evident, from the outline given above, of the efforts made to spread the light of the Gospel in Germany, and of the triumphs achieved, that, in the reign of Charlemagne, Christianity had already extended as far as the Elbe. In Germany, as in the Roman Empire, Christianity met with a very determined opposition, and was forced to contend against almost insuperable obstacles; but now, as then, God raised up in His Church a band of devoted and faithful workers, *heroic bishops and zealous priests*, who went forth joyfully to announce the tidings of the Gospel to these poor people, and who proved, by the *gift of miracles* which accompanied them, that their work had the sanction of Heaven. And in speaking of these devoted men, it is worthy of remark that, while they were engaged in preaching the Word of God, many pious *princesses* and well-born ladies provided for their wants. We have seen that the religious notions of the early Germans predisposed them favorably to Christianity, while their minds were altogether alienated from their idols when they beheld the missionaries dash them to the ground with impunity. The missionaries also practiced toward the Germans the prudence and moderation so warmly recommended by Gregory the Great, and, instead of frightening away, by unnecessary severity, either those who had already come into the Church or such as were preparing to do so, they adjusted, where such a course was possible, the requirements of Christian law, and tempered its severity so as not to do unnecessary violence to the prejudices and practices of their idolaters. The feasts of the saints came in place of these Pagan orgies; the Cross was set up on the altar whence an idol had been cast down, and Pagan temples became the dwelling-places of the Most High God.

---

[1] On *Verden*, cf. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 582 sq.; French transl., Vol. XXIV., p. 525 sq.

CHAPTER II.

MODIFICATIONS IN THE RELATIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

Capitularia regum Francor., see Vol. I., p. 23, n. 3, ed. *Baluzi*, Venet. 1772-1773, 2 T. fol., and in *Pertz*, Monumenta, T. III., with valuable chronological disquisitions. We quote from the one more spread about, ed. Baluzi. *Friedrich*, Three Unpublished Councils of Merovingian Times, Bambg. 1867. *Maassen*, Two Synods under King Childeric II., according to a Manuscript of the City Library of *Albi*, Gratz, 1867.

†*Thomassini* vetus et nova eccl. Disciplina. *Plank*, Hist. of the Organization of Eccl. Society, Vol. II. *Grimm*, Antiquities of German Law, Götting. 1828. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., "The Church and the Germanic Kingdoms," p. 61–113. †*Binterim*, Philosophical Hist. of the German National Councils, Pts. I. and II.; Succession of all the Bishops and Archbishops of Germany, Pt. I., p. 282–340. **Lau*, On the Influence of the Feudal System upon the Clergy and the Papacy. (*Jllgen's* Hist. Journal, year 1841, nros. 1 and 2.) Thereto, *Phillips'* German Hist., Vol. I., p. 506 sq. *Zöpfl*, Hist. of German Law, 3d ed., Stuttg. 1858, and the writings of *Rettberg*, **Fehr*, *Rückert;* **Gfrörer*, On the Hist. of German Popular Rights, in the M. A., 2 vols., Schaffh. 1865.

§ 161. *The Church in Her Relations to the Germanic States—Close Alliance of Church and State.*

The essential elements of ecclesiastical polity, as developed among the Greeks and Romans, now passed, without material change, over to the Germanic people, who, after their conversion, regarded Roman law as inseparably connected with the Church. Hence, as "every one," according to an axiom of German jurisprudence, "preserves intact his hereditary rights,"[1] so did the Church and her ministers continue to follow the Roman civil law and the Dionysian or Spanish collection of canon law.[2] It is especially noticeable, and perhaps more so in the Frankish Empire than elsewhere, that these canons passed, though insensibly, yet definitely, into the public law and the Capitularies. It could not be expected that the Church would maintain precisely the same relations with a rude and barbarous people which she had with nations of a more *advanced and refined civilization.* Before such a state of things could be brought about, a certain *amount of teaching and a thorough reformation of manners* were necessary, and it was the Church's duty to effect the one and impart the other. Faithful to her mission, she did not shrink from the task; but, to accomplish it successfully, she was obliged to adopt, in a great measure, a new system and a novel policy in her *external* relations to the State and to society. On the one hand, it was necessary to obtain *greater political independence*, and, on the other, to rise to civil influence and importance, in order that she might be in a position to widen the sphere of her jurisdiction and infuse Christian ideas into the masses of the people.

---

[1] *Walter*, Corpus juris German. antiqui., Berol. 1824 sq., 3 T. *Pertz*, Monumenta Germ., T. III. and IV. (containing leges.) Cf. Regesta Carolorum, Documents of all the Carlovingians (752–918), epitomized by *Böhmer*, Frkft. 1834, 4to.

[2] Conf. *Conc. Aurel.* I. (A. D. 511) can. 1: Id constituimus observandum quod

Ecclesiastics, who spent their days in the contemplation of things human and divine, seemed at least as well qualified to administer justice intelligently and impartially as persons who had passed their lives in the profession of arms; and the more so as they *alone possessed all the knowledge and culture of the age.* Hence—1. In Spain, Reccared commanded the judges to *attend the ecclesiastical synods, in order that they might there learn the law;*[1] while, on the other hand, he instructed the bishops to watch over the administration of

---

ecclesiastici canones decreverunt et lex Romana constituit. (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1009). The principle is enforced: Ecclesia vivit lege Romana (Leg. Ripuar. tit. LVIII. 1); see *Maassen*, lex Rom. canonice compta, Vienna, 1860. *Friedberg*, de finium inter et ecclesiam et civitatem judicio, qui medii aevi doctores et leges statuerint, Leips. 1861.

[1] *Concil. Toletan.* III. a. 589, capitul. 18: Judices vero locorum, vel actores fiscalium patrimoniorum ex decreto gloriosissimi domini nostri simul cum sacerdotali concilio—in unum conveniant, *ut discant*, quam pie et juste cum populis agere debeant.—Sunt enim prospectores Episcopi secundum regiam admonitionem, qualiter judices cum populis agant, ita ut ipsos praemonitos corrigant, aut insolentias eorum auditibus principis innotescant. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 482.) The Frankish ordinance by Chlotar: Si judex aliquem contra legem injuste damnaverit, in nostri absentia ab Episcopis castigetur, ut quod perperе judicavit, versatim melius discussione habita emendare procuret. (*Baluz.* T. I., p. 7.)

justice. Similar provisions were made in the Frankish kingdom in the year 585. 2. To render judgment in *all matrimonial causes* was regarded among the Burgundian Germans more positively even than among the ancient Romans, as a distinct and peculiar office of the priesthood, inasmuch as these were considered as belonging to the category of things sacred. 3. *Last wills and testaments*, especially when there was question of goods bequeathed to the Church, were always submitted to the bishops. 4. Under the Frankish, as under the Roman law,[1] ecclesiastics enjoyed certain *privileges and immunities;* for example, they were considered as wholly under the jurisdiction of the bishop, and not within the competence of civil tribunals, unless when guilty of atrocious crimes; and then only *after* they had been degraded from their dignity and office.[2] It is clear, therefore, that there were circumstances in which the power of the Church and that of the State were in such harmonious accord that it was difficult to say precisely where one ended and the other commenced. The ceremony of the *coronation* of *kings*,[3] which was at this time being gradually introduced, is a most striking evidence of this coalition of the two powers. The Church imparted to the State a divine blessing, and invested it with an authority which, bearing the sanction of religion, inspired both reverence and awe, and was alone capable of preserving civil order and restraining the pride and insolence of a barbarous people. There were many other instances of the coalition or harmonious action of the civil and ecclesiastical orders—such, for example, as the participation of the State in the election of bishops; in the holding of ecclesiastical synods, and the ratification of their decrees; in the institution of ecclesiastical circuit courts or diocesan visitations;[1] and, particularly, in the readiness with which the civil authority lent its aid to the execution of that portion of ecclesiastical legislation which directly and immediately affected the Church's external relations with society. So *intimate were the relations of Church and State*, that they gave rise to legislative bodies, altogether without precedent in the history of the Church, known as *Mixed Synods*, bearing a very close resemblance to a diet,[2] and composed of both clerical and lay persons, as-

---

[1] The Druids likewise, as we learn from *Caesar* de bello Gallico, enjoyed *immunity:* Druides a bello abesse consueverant, neque tributa cum reliquis pendunt, militiae vacationem omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. (VI. 14.)

[2] Capitular., lib. VII., c. 422: Placuit, ut Clerici non distringantur vel dijudicentur nisi a propriis Episcopis. Fas enim non est, ut divini muneris ministri temporalium potestatum subdantur arbitrio. Nam si propriorum Episcoporum jussionibus inobedientes extiterint, tunc juxta canonicas sanctiones per potestates exteras adducantur, i. e. per judices saeculares. (*Baluz.* T. I.)

[3] "The religious consecration of the new sovereign was introduced first into the Eastern Roman Empire. The first known example is that of Theodosius the Younger, who was crowned by the patriarch Proclus. In the following century, the Emperor Justinus caused himself to be crowned by Pope John I., although he had before received the crown from the hands of the patriarch John. Of the new German Christian kingdoms, the Spanish was the first that adopted this ceremony. (King Wamba was the first, A. D. 672.—TR.) In the first canon of the twelfth synod of Toledo, it is said of King Erwig that he received his regal power by the sacred unction. By the Merovingian kings of the Franks, the rite was not practiced. Pepin was the first. . . . After his time, all the kings were crowned, and the rite was introduced by the East-Franks into Germany, where Conrad I. was the first who was consecrated in this manner. The sovereign to be crowned read a profession of Catholic faith; he then swore, at the desire of the bishops, to maintain to all prelates, and to the churches intrusted to them, their canonical privileges; to protect and to defend, according to his power, every and each bishop and his church, and to preserve invio-

---

late the rights and laws of the people." *Döllinger's* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., pp. 166, 167, Eng. trans.

In Britain, the Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, which dates back to the eighth century, contains a rite for the coronation of kings.

This ceremony was usually accompanied with the more important and imposing rite of anointing with oil, signifying a particular and special consecration of the anointed to the service of God. The term for consecration in the Saxon chronicle is "gehalgod," that is, hallowed or consecrated. A copy of one of the Gospels, on which the Saxon kings took the coronation oath, is still preserved in the British Museum. Cf. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 67 et sq.; *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. 20, p. 218–231. *Chambers' Cyclop.*, art. Coronat. (Tr.)

[1] Already in the ep. Synod. Aurelian. I. (a. 511) ad Clodoveum regem, it is said: Quia tanta ad religionis cathol. cultum gloriosae fidei cura vos excitat, ut sacerdotalis mentis affectu sacerdotes de rebus necessariis tractaturos in unum colligi jusseritis, secundum voluntatis vestrae consultationem, et titulos quos dedistis, ea quae vobis visum est definitione respondimus; ita ut si ea, quae nos statuimus, etiam vestro recta esse judicio comprobantur, tanti consensus regis ac domini majori auctoritate servandam tantorum firmet sententiam sacerdotum (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1008.) Thus Charlemagne called five synods. The bishops assembled at Tours, at the conclusion of their proceedings, declared: "We have noted down the chapters to be laid before the emperor." *Binterim*, Pt. I., p. 223.

[2] The preface to the Synod of Mentz (813) may be taken as a particular

sembled to provide for the good government of both orders. The institution of the *Missi Dominici* was but the complement of the system of which the Mixed Synods were the legislative branch. This was the *Imperial Court of Judicature*, formed on the model of the ecclesiastical circuit courts or diocesan visitations, and composed of clerics and laymen, who assembled four times a year to execute the laws, both ecclesiastical and civil.[1] Thus, while, on the one hand, the reverence which necessarily attaches to the priestly office, and the learning and culture of the clergy, opened to them a wide sphere of action and usefulness; on the other, the vulgar and insolent pride of rude and barbarous princes, who, in their wild schemes of ambition and in their love of rule, entirely lose sight of religious principles and obligations, seriously threatened the independence and impeded the progress and internal development of the Church. There were, however, many well-disposed princes who reposed a loving and filial confidence in the Church, and contributed to bring about that *beautiful harmony* which shortly characterized the relations of the *two orders*. Its results were particularly beneficial and manifest in the great empire of Charlemagne, where it formed the *underlying and fundamental principle* of all legislation. That these results were more evident here than else-

---

instance in illustration of the harmonious action of Church and State: Incipientes igitur in nomine Domini communi consensu et voluntate tractare pariter de statu verae religionis, ac de utilitate et profectu christianae plebis, convenit nobis, de nostro communi collegio clericorum seu laicorum tres facere turmas, sicut et fecimus. In prima autem turma consederunt Episcopi cum quibusdam notariis, legentes atque tractantes St. evangelium nec non epistolas et actus Apostolorum, canones quoque, etc.—diligenti studio perquirentes, quibus modis statum ecclesiae Dei et christianae plebis proficere et conservare potuissent. In alia vero turma consederunt Abbates, etc.—In tertia denique turma sederunt comites et judices, in mundanis legibus decertantes, vulgi justitias perquirentes omniumque advenientium causas diligenter examinantes modis, quibus poterant, justitias terminantes. (*Harzheim*, Conc. Germ., T. I., p. 405.) *Binterim*, Hist. of German Councils, Pt. I., p. 104 sq. "Nature of Mixed Synods," *synodi mixtae*.

[1] The Capitularia reg. Franc., ed *Baluz.* Ven. contain at their head the tractatus de *Missis Dominicis*, Franc. de *Roye* Andegavensis (T. I., p. L–CXLVIII); likewise, *Muratorii* diss. de missis regiis (T. II., p. VI–XX), from ejusd. antiquit. Ital. med. aevi, T. I., p. 455 sq.

where, is probably owing to the fact that, through the genius of Charlemagne, the empire early recovered from the disasters consequent upon the invasion of the barbarians.

§ 162. *Enlarged Possessions of the Church.* Cf. § 127.

In the early days of Christianity, the ancient and noble families of Rome, inspired by feelings of gratitude and love, had made large bequests to the churches of those countries now inhabited by German tribes; but these possessions were, for the most part, lost during the shock and convulsions which followed the migration of nations. The singular and exceptional reverence which the Germans always entertained for their priests, and the facility with which, under the influence of Christianity, they assimilated the elements of Roman civilization, seemed to indicate that this barbarous people, after it had reached some degree of civilization, would be still more generous in donations to the Church than even the early Roman Christians had been. This anticipation was fully realized; for, toward the close of the reign of Charlemagne, these regenerated and vigorous nations, grateful for the blessings and treasures which they had received through the Church, and, acting under the firm belief that such gifts would be meritorious in the sight of God,[1] contributed voluntarily, abundantly, and with daily increasing generosity,[2] to the maintenance of ecclesiastical institutions.

But, for all this, the bulk of the clergy, as well as schools and monasteries, were frequently in great need of assistance, and the synods of *Tours* (A. D. 560) and *Macon* (A. D. 586) energetically exhorted the faithful to pay the *tithes* ordained by God. Charlemagne made their payment obligatory on his subjects by *a royal ordinance* of the year 779, with the requirements of which he himself faithfully complied.[3] But, as many *bishops* and *abbots* began, about this time, to hold *fiefs* from the crown, they acquired large possessions, and became comparatively wealthy, and also, in a measure, dependent upon the civil power. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that there were to be found among them avaricious persons who were not, at times, over-honest in the administration and disposition of ecclesiastical property, and, in consequence, many synods held during the course of the seventh and eighth centuries revived earlier decrees of the Church, requiring that the inferior clergy should be exactly informed as to the condition of the estates of the Church, and the uses to which their revenues were applied.

---

[1] Rom. xv. 27.

[2] Conf. *Thomassini*, l. c., Pt. III., lib. I., c. 19–23.

[3] *Thomassini*, l. c., Pt. III., lib. I., c. 6–7.

Among the Germans, as among the Greeks and Romans, it was customary for the bishops to appoint *stewards* or *procurators*,[1] to look after the administration of the ecclesiastical domains. As the people advanced in civilization, and political governments became more stable, the administration of ecclesiastical property, whether belonging to bishops or to monasteries, was intrusted to laymen (advocati togati, armati), and, in the year 802, Charlemagne prescribed the qualifications and defined the duties of these agents.[2] Those who had founded churches frequently reserved to themselves and to their heirs the right of administering the temporal concerns of such foundations. But, while the faithful provided generously for the maintenance of the Church and her clergy, from motives of piety and gratitude, warlike princes, such as *Charles Martel*, robbed her of her possessions and distributed them among his soldiers;[1] and needy sovereigns, like *Pepin*, took the same means to refill the coffers that had been emptied by the extravagance of Merovingians.

---

[1] *Thomassini*, l. c., Pt. III, lib. II., c. 1 and 5–9.

[2] The Roman Prof. *de Camillis*, in his Institutes of Canon Law, says on the subject: "Saeculo VI. and VII., deficiente advocatia imperiali et regali, Romani Pontifices ex se coeperunt constituere Ecclesiarum defensores, atque idipsum omnes ecclesiae praestiterunt. Qui defensores *ex subdiaconis* plerumque assumebantur, pluribus aucti sunt honoribus, eisque annuus census a singulis ecclesiis persolutus est; nec eorum tantum personis, sed familiae ipsorum hoc *advocatiae* munus videbatur concessum, ita ut filii patribus in eo succederent. Atque haec disciplina medio praesertim aevo obtinuit.—Sed rebus compositis, supremi imperantes illud advocatiae munus sibi vindicarunt; et utinam bona fide id praestitissent ita ut sub praetextu tuendi Ecclesiam ejus jura non invasissent, sibique usurpassent. En historia juris advocatiae." Hence the emperor obtained, although not the order, yet the office, of subdeaconship, at the Pope's solemn mass, and the "*dalmatica imperialis*," with the *μεταμόρφωσις τοῦ κυρίου* stitched on it by Byzantine skill, is still shown in the sacristy of St. Peter's, Rome, as a relic of the times and person of Charlemagne. (Tr.)

§ 163. *Increased Dependence of the Church upon the State—Administration of Metropolitan and Diocesan Sees.*

The peculiar position accupied by the Church, when brought fully into contact with the German nations, necessarily produced a very marked influence upon the *episcopal office and dignity*, in so far as these were connected with the merely external aspects of social and political life. *Bishops* and *abbots* became gradually identified with the institutions of the *feudal system.* As a knowledge of this system is essential to a correct judgment and just appreciation of the Middle Ages, it will be necessary to study the history of the Franks in Gaul, where it was more fully developed than among any other people.

While it is undoubtedly true that many bishops and abbots, desirous of coming into possession of allodial estates, acted from purely sordid motives, still it can not be denied that the spiritual seed which had been sown among these rude people, and was now bursting into life, would never have reached its full development and maturity, had not the clergy succeeded in establishing themselves permanently in the country. This, however, could be effected only by entering into close alliance and maintaining intimate relations with the great and powerful, who commanded the respect and obedience of the lower orders. Hence, in order that bishops and abbots might be regarded with similar feelings, it was necessary that they should become, in some sort, the *equals of the nobility*, and, *like them, be qualified to take their places in the diet of the empire.* But the only available way of rising to such distinction and consideration among a coarse and semi-civilized people was to follow the example of the lay lords of France and acquire *large landed possessions*, held either *in freehold* or *in fief.*[2]

---

[1] *Roth*, Secularization (apportionment) of the estates of the Church under the Carlovingians (Munich Historical Annuaries, year 1865, p. 277 sq.)

[2] A freehold, or *allodium*, was possessed in absolute independence of the lord

The system of letting lands out in fief was the basis and underlying principle of the Frankish kingdom.[1]

That bishops and abbots administered their estates with a due regard to the rights of those who dwelt upon them, seems evident, from the fact that the people always preferred to see lands pass into the possession of religious rather than secular liege-lords. They were incomparably more happy and contented under the rule of the crozier than under that of the sword. Such as held lands in fief from religious were called "*sanctuarii*," or "those of the house of God." They were much better to do, obtained freedom more readily than those holding of secular lords, and were frequently promoted to the highest dignities. Hence the origin of the proverb: "*It is good to live under the crook.*"

Had not the Church broken through this system of brute force, filled the mind of man with high ideas, generous impulses, and a consciousness of his noble destiny, it would have been impossible for any merely temporal power to have led the German nation from the darkness of barbarism to the full light of civilization. It was with this view that bishops, who were truly such, used all the advantages that feudalism placed within their reach. They had a great and responsible mission, and they labored faithfully to accomplish it. They ameliorated the condition of the slave, gradually abolished slavery itself, and broke down the barriers which had separated bondmen from free.

The *evil* which came upon the Church by reason of her connection with the feudal system, will more than balance the good. The distinction between things sacred and profane was gradually lost sight of; ecclesiastics became the vassals of kings, and, as such, mingled with the worldly, and shared their dissipations. Then were sown the seeds of the long and terrible struggle between the throne and the altar, the Church and the Empire.

---

paramount; while a fief, or *beneficium*, was held on certain stated conditions, generally a duty of military service. (Tr.)

[1] Conf. *Luden*, German Hist., Book VII., chap. 4, 5 (Pt. III., p. 285-309). *Phillips*, German Hist., Vol. I., § 25, p. 495 sq.; Vol. II., p. 454 sq., and the Dissertation, quoted on p. 407, by *Lau*.

Even *the appointments to bishoprics*, which, according to ecclesiastical canons, should have been the result of the concurrent choice of the bishops of the province, and of the clergy and laity of each diocese, were wholly *dependent upon the arbitrary will of princes.* Whatever qualifications men so appointed may have possessed, they were not, at any rate, such as would recommend them as fit persons to preside over the destinies of the Church. They were courtiers, and not ecclesiastics. Having received their appointments, they were hastily promoted to holy orders, without regard to the rule of the Church, requiring an observance of the interstices. Moreover, as those who held land in fief became, by this very fact, the *vassals* of princes, such, when appointed to bishoprics and abbotships, were required to take an oath, not only of personal, but also of feudal, fealty (the *vassalagium* or *homagium*) to their liege lord, by which they bound themselves to serve the king in war, to appear at court when commanded to do so, to assist at his tribunals, and to remain subject to his jurisdiction. Again, since *every free-born man* among the Germans *was liable to military duty*, and could not enter either the clerical or monastic state[1] without the permission of the government, it was necessary to recruit the ranks of the clergy from among those who, formerly serfs, had been set free by the Church. Owing to their former inferior condition, they were often kept in a humiliating state of dependence by bishops who owed their appointments to the favor of princes, and who were naturally proud of their rank and fortune. Finally, as the duty of taking the field in time of war created among the clergy a taste for the profession of arms, it was found necessary to enact many laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, by which all *ecclesiastics* were strictly forbidden *to become soldiers, to bear arms, or to engage in battle.* So distasteful were such prohibitions, that it was thought prudent to add a declaration totally disclaiming any intention of putting a slight upon the priesthood or the Church, by thus disqualifying ecclesiastics to bear arms.[1]

---

[1] *Conc. Aurel.* I., under Clovis, A. D. 511, prescribes, can. 4: Ut nullus saecularium ad clericatus officium praesumatur, nisi aut cum regis jussione aut cum judicis voluntate. (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1009.) Likewise, Caroli M. capitulare a. 805, c. 15: De liberis hominibus, qui ad servitium Dei se tradere volunt, ut prius hoc non faciant, quam a nobis licentiam postulent. (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 298.) It is therefore, too, that the *Conc. Toletan.* IV., A. D. 633, c. 74, permits to appoint serfs priests and deacons: De famulis ecclesiae constituere presbyteros et diaconos per parochias licet: quos tamen vitae rectitudo et probitas morum commendat; *ea tamen ratione, ut antea manumissi libertatem status sui percipiant*, et denuo ad ecclesiasticos honores succedant: irreligiosum est enim obligatos existere servituti, qui sacri ordinis suscipiunt dignitatem. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 592.)

The Church protested against the interference of the State in the appointment of bishops, and made an effort to correct the abuse, by threatening to refuse to recognize any bishop appointed by royal decree, unless he should also have been canonically elected by the bishops of the province.[2] This threat was, however, frequently disregarded by such as had power to enforce their demands.

---

[1] *Conc.* auctor. Bonif. a. 743, can. 2: Servis Dei per omnia armaturam portare, vel pugnare, aut in exercitum et in hostem pergere, omnino prohibuimus: nisi illis tantum, qui propter divinum Mysterium, missarum scilicet solemnia adimplenda et Sanctorum patrocinia portanda ad hoc electi sunt: i. e. unum vel duos Episcopos cum capellanis et presbyteris eorum princeps secum habeat, etc. (*Harzheim*, conc. Germ., T. I., p. 49. *Binterim*, Hist. of the German Councils, Vol. II., p. 117 sq.) It was, however, only when the wounding and killing of several ecclesiastics on the field of battle had produced a terrible impression, that Charlemagne opposed this abuse in a positive manner by his capitulare VIII. a. 803: Volumus, ut nullus sacerdos in hostem pergat, nisi duo vel tres tantum Episcopi, electione caeterorum, propter benedictionem et praedicationem populique reconciliationem et cum illis electi sacerdotes, qui bene sciant populis poenitentias dare, Missas celebrare, de infirmis curam habere, sacratique olei cum sacris precibus unctionem impendere et hoc maxime praevidere, ne sine viatico quis de saeculo recedat. Hi vero nec arma ferant, nec ad pugnam pergant,—sed tantum Sanctorum pignora et sacra ministeria ferant et orationibus pro viribus insistant. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 287.) Yet it was added: Quod honores sacerdotum et res ecclesiarum auferre vel minuere eis noluissemus! (l. c., p. 288.)

[2] Already *Gregory* of Tours complains of arbitrariness in conferring and acquiring ecclesiastical dignities: Jam tunc germen illud iniquum coeperat pullulare, ut sacerdotium aut venderetur a regibus aut compararetur a clericis. (Vitae Patrum, c. 4, de St. Gallo Episc. max. bibl., T. XI., p. 939.) Likewise, *Gregor.* Hist. Franc. IV. 15, VIII. 39, IX. 23. See *Phillips*, Vol. I., p. 673 sq. Against such abuses, *Conc. Arvern.* a. 535, can. 2: Diligenter itaque (in eligendis sacerdotibus) quisque inspiciat pretium dominici gregis, ut sciat, quod meritum constituendi deceat esse pastoris. Episcopatum ergo desiderans, electione clericorum vel civium, consensu etiam metropolitani ejusdem provinciae, pontifex ordinetur. Non patrocinia potentum adhibeat, non calliditate subdola ad conscribendum decretum alios hortetur praemiis, alios timore compellat. (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1181.) *Conc. Aurel.* V. a. 549, can. 10: Ut nulli episcopatum praemiis

Freedom of *ecclesiastical* elections was restored through the efforts of *St. Boniface* and by the decrees of *Charlemagne.*

The exercise of the royal sanction, a right similar to that exercised by the Graeco-Roman emperors, was looked upon as a thing of course, and no one ever thought of challenging it.

After St. Boniface had fully organized the hierarchy in the East-Frankish kindgom, *metropolitans* frequently asserted and claimed the rights belonging to their sees; but, though these rights were admitted and confirmed, the exercise of them was frequently obstructed by the anomalous political position of certain bishops. The practice of *holding provincial councils annually* had been almost entirely neglected, and ecclesiastical administration, morals, and discipline had suffered in consequence. St. Boniface therefore exerted himself to revive the practice, and, though his efforts were in a measure successful,[1] these synods never rose to their former importance. The

---

aut comparatione liceat adipisci, sed *cum voluntate regis* juxta electionem cleri et plebis, sicut in antiquis canonibus tenetur scriptum, a metropolitano, etc. (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1445.) *Conc. Paris.* III., a. 557, can. 8. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 339.) Repeatedly *Conc. Paris.* V., a. 615, can. I. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 551.) *Gregorii M.* epp. lib. XI. ep. 61. ad Chlotar. Francor. regem: Pervenit ad nos, quod sacri illic ordines cum datione pecuniae conferantur. Et vehementer affligimur, si ad Dei dona non meritis acceditur, sed praemiis prosilitur. Et quia haec *simoniaca haeresis* (!) prima in ecclesia surgens, Apostolorum est auctoritate damnata, petimus, ut pro mercede vestra congregari Synodum faciatis, etc. (Opp. T. II., p. 1147 sq.) *Charlemagne's* capitulare I. a. 803, c. 2: Sacrorum canonum non ignari, ut in Dei nomine sancta ecclesia suo liberius potiretur honore, adsensum ordini ecclesiastico praebuimus, ut Episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de propria dioecesi, remota personarum et munerum acceptione, ob vitae meritum et sapientiae donum *eligantur*, ut exemplo et verbo sibi subjectis usquequaque prodesse valeant. (*Baluz.* T. I., p. 269.) Accordingly, the report of *Sigebert of Gemblours*, that Charles, at a Lateran synod of 153 bishops, obtained authority to fill the papal chair, and to invest all the archbishops and bishops, is a manifest forgery, occasioned by the contest on investitures. Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. III., p. 579.

[1] Conf. *Binterim*, Hist. of German Councils, Vol. II., p. 1 sq. Already *Gregory the Great* had repeatedly urged the convocation of synods in the Frankish Empire. Epp. lib. XI., ep. 55–61, ep. 63.

reason of this is not far to seek. In the first place, the convocation of them was dependent upon the pleasure of the prince;[1] and secondly, they gradually lost their strictly ecclesiastical character and became of the nature of a diet, and hence were called "*Mixed Synods.*" Moreover, the gradually but steadily increasing authority of the popes, and the extensive claims put forward and exercised by papal legates, checked the growth and limited the influence of metropolitan institutions. Each *bishop* was strictly required to make an annual visitation of his diocese, and such visitations were called *Synodal Courts.* To facilitate the transaction of business in these courts, dioceses were divided into districts, over each of which an *archdeacon*[2] presided. Instead of one archdeacon, who had been formerly vicar-general to the bishop, there were now many—the number sometimes reaching as high as seven, as in the case of the diocese of Strasburg. *Heddo*, the bishop of this see, obtained the consent of Pope

---

[1] *Gregor. Turon.* hist. Francor. VIII. 20. Interim dies placiti advenit et Episcopi ex *jussu Regis* Gunthramni apud Matescensem urbem collecti sunt.—*Sigeberti* Regis epist. ad Desiderium Episc. (about 650): Nobis cum nostris proceribus convenit, ut sine nostra scientia synodale concilium in regno nostro non agatur, nec ad istas Kal. Septemb. nulla conjunctio sacerdotum ex his, qui ad nostram ditionem pertinere noscuntur, non fiat. (*Baluz.* T. I., p. 101.)

[2] Bishops divided their dioceses into several districts (*capitula ruralia*), over each of which an archdeacon (archpriest?—Tr.) presided. He subsequently became subordinate to the *archdeacon* of the cathedral church, who, though only a deacon, and, in many instances, only a layman, exercised a more extensive and superior authority. Hence, the many protests against his encroachments and arrogance. *Conc. Toletan.* IV. a. 633, can. 39: Nonnulli diacones in tantam erumpunt superbiam, ut se anteponant atque in primo loco ipsi priores stare praesumant presbyteris in secundo choro constitutis. (*Harduin*, T. III, p. 587.) *Conc. Emeritense* a. 666, can. 5: Ad suam personam (episcop.) non aliter nisi aut archipresbyterum suum diriget (in concilium); aut si archipresbytero impossibilitas fuerit, presbyterum utilem—a tergo Episcoporum inter presbyteros sedere, et quaeque in eo concilio fuerint acta, scire et subscribere. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 1000.) *Conc. Remense* (about 630), can. 19: Ut in parochiis nullus laicorum archipresbyter praeponatur. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 573.) Capitulare IV., Caroli M., a. 803, c. 2: Ut laici non sint praepositi monachorum in monasterio, nec *Archidiaconi* sint laici. (*Baluz.* T. I., p. 303.) At the synod, held by Boniface, A. D. 745, it was decreed: Praevideant episcopi, ne cupiditas archidiaconorum suorum culpas nutriat, quia multis modis mentitur iniquitas sibi. (*Bonifac.* epp. ed. *Würdtwein*, p. 161.) Likewise, *Thomassini* l. c., P. I., lib. II., c. 4, 5.

Hadrian I. to the system (A. D. 774), and was the first to organize it and put it into complete working order.[1] The functions of the *chorepiscopus*,[2] an office which had passed into Germany from the Graeco-Roman Empire, were early restricted to the ordinary duties of priests.[3]

§. 164. *The Primacy—Spiritual Power of the Popes.*

The respect universally entertained for the Head of the Church by the German people must unquestionably be ascribed to the fact that a great majority of the missionaries who came among them to preach the Gospel had been either *approved* or *sent directly by the Holy See*, and, during their stay, uniformly consulted it on all matters affecting the religious and social condition of the faithful. Hence they knew the Bishop of Rome *only* as the Head of the Catholic world, a prerogative which the *popes* of every age have claimed, and which *the most enlightened men of this epoch* constantly, distinctly, and emphatically maintained.[4] It is an undeniable fact that, since the days of Siricius and Leo the Great, *vicars-apostolic* exercised supreme jurisdiction in almost every Christian country; as, for example, in Spain, during the pontificate of Gregory the Great.

---

[1] Cf. *Grandidier*, Hist. de l'église de Strasb., Vol. I., pp. 176, 291; Vol. II., Document nro. 66. *Planck*, Hist. of the Organization of Eccl. Society, Vol. II., p. 584 sq.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 394.

[3] Capit. a. 799: Placuit, ne Chorepiscopi a quibusquam deinceps fiant, quoniam hactenus a nescientibus sanctorum Patrum et maxime Apostolicorum decreta suisque quietibus ac delectationibus inhaerentibus facti sunt—a. 803: Ut hi, qui a Chorepiscopis presbyteri vel diaconi aut subdiaconi sunt ordinati, nullatenus in presbyteratus vel diaconatus aut subdiaconatus officio ministrare praesumant. (*Baluz.* T. I., pp. 233, 746.) *Migne*, ser. lat., Vol. 97, p. 764 and p. 830. (Tr.)

[4] *Hadrian I.* said of the Roman episcopate: Sedes apostolica caput totius mundi et omnium Dei ecclesiarum—cujus sollicitudo delegata divinitus cunctis debetur ecclesiis;—a qua si quis se abscidit, fit christianae religionis extorris.—Quae de omnibus ecclesiis fas habet judicandi, neque cuiquam licet de ejus judicare judicio, quorumlibet sententiis ligata pontificum jus habebit, solvendi, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiae cura confluit. Cod. Carolin. ed. *Cenni*, Parmae, 1519.—*Beda Venerabilis:* Quis nesciat, beatissimum Petrum omnium Apostolorum principem fuisse? (Comment. in Joan., c. 13.) *Alcuin*, the greatest scholar of his age, writes, ep. 20. ad Leon. III.: Princeps ecclesiae, hujus immaculatae columbae, nutritor—vere dignum esse fateor, omnem illius gregis multitudinem suo pastori licet in diversis terrarum pascuis commorantem una caritatis fide subjectam esse.

The question submitted to the judgment of Pope Zachary by Burkhard, bishop of Strasburg, and Fulrad, a priest of St. Denys, when they asked, in the case of *Pepin*, the mayor of the palace, and King *Childeric*, "if it were not just that one who possessed the royal authority should also enjoy the title of king," is a most striking and significant example of the exercise of the plenitude of power centered in the Head of the Church. The Pope, in giving his decision in favor of Pepin,[1] did so with strict regard to the *legal aspects* of the question, alleging, as his reasons, that the *electoral vote* of the nobles of the Germanic kingdoms should be respected, and the fact that Pepin had, in reality, if not in name, possessed and exercised the royal authority in the Frankish kingdom for years. Thus did the Pope strengthen the authority and consecrate the temporal power of Pepin by imparting to them a divine sanction, and giving orders to Boniface to crown him king, at Soissons (A. D. 752). The ceremony of coronation was performed for *Charlemagne* about a half a century later. Speaking of the relations of this prince to the Holy See, even *Voltaire* says: "If, at this time, the kingdom of Charlemagne alone possessed some measure of culture, this is probably to be ascribed to the fact that the *emperor had made a journey to Rome.*"

The bishops assembled at the first German Synod, held in the year 742, promised, under oath, to render *canonical obedience to the Pope;*[2] and those summoned by Charlemagne to examine into the charges brought against Leo III. promptly and emphatically declared that "*it was the right of the Pope to judge them, but not theirs to judge him.*"[1]

---

[1] It is a remarkable and significant fact, that no writer of that age challenged the validity or legality of this decision. Cf. *Phillips*, Hist. of Germ., Vol. I., p. 522–527.

[2] *Bonifacii* ep. 105, in *Serarius* (max. bibl. T. XIII., p. 113): Decrevimus autem in nostro synodali conventu et confessi sumus fidem catholicam et unitatem, et subjectionem Romanae ecclesiae, fine tenus vitae nostrae, velle servare: St. Petro et vicario ejus velle subjici: synodum per omnes annos congregare: Metropolitanos pallia ab illa sede quaerere: et per omnia praecepta Petri canonice sequi desiderare, ut inter oves sibi commendatas numeremur. Cf. *Würdtwein*, ep. 73, p. 179. *Mansi*, T. XII., p. 365. See the oath taken by Boniface above, on p. 114.

Even the *Frankish Capitularies* recognized the right of the Bishop of Rome to examine and approve or reject the decrees of provincial synods.[2]

The metropolitans of the Frankish Empire, like those of the Graeco-Roman, regularly received the *pallium* from the Pope; and here, also, bishops suffering from the oppression of ambitious metropolitans, and priests unjustly persecuted by their bishops, sent their complaints and made known their griefs to the common father of the faithful, from whom they uniformly obtained justice.[3]

The emperor Constantine Pogonatus (A. D. 668–685) granted the Roman clergy and people full freedom in the *election* of popes, and *Leo II.* (A. D. 682–683) and *Benedict II.* († A. D. 685), who ascended the papal throne in his reign, were consecrated without even having been confirmed by either the emperor himself or the exarch of Ravenna. It would appear, however, that this privilege was withdrawn, under succeeding popes, on account of the determined resistance which they, during the reign of Justinian II. (A. D. 685–695, when he was expelled, and after his return, in the year 705, he reigned till A. D. 711), offered to the decrees of the Trullan Synod of 692.

Leo the Isaurian, who, besides being an iconoclast, was also a despot, showed still less favor to Rome, and endeavored, by every instrument of power at his command, to enslave the Church, because the popes Gregory II. (A. D. 715–731) and Gregory III. (A. D. 731–741) firmly resisted his decrees requiring the destruction of statues and images. Neither is it probable that freedom of election was permitted in the choice of the *six* succeeding popes, all of whom, from Conon († A. D.

---

[1] Conf. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 936. *Mansi*, T. XIII., p. 1044. *Alcuini* ep. 92.

[2] Capitular. lib. VII., cap. 349: Ut comprovincialis synodus retractetur per vicarios urbis Romae Episcopi, si ipse decreverit. (*Baluz.* T. I., p. 735, from capit. Angilramni, c. 42, at the end of the eighth century; cf. *Baluz.* T. I., p 195.) *Boniface* likewise sent the acts of the councils held by him, for examination and approbation, to Rome.

[3] Such appeals had been recognized by the Council of Sardica, held A. D. 343. See Vol. I., p. 671, note 1.

687) to Constantine (A. D. 708–715), were either Greeks or Syrians. Even after the Popes had rid themselves of the yoke of the Greek Empire, and escaped the still more degrading bondage of the Lombards; and after they had, at a critical moment, asserted and maintained their *political independence*, still the election of a pope was liable to dangers of no ordinary magnitude. The people and the clergy now enjoyed perfect freedom, but their interests seem to have clashed; for, while the former regarded only the political, the latter looked chiefly to the ecclesiastical qualifications of the candidates.

In this unsettled condition of the Roman Church, the political and religious importance of which was daily on the increase, a system of election was required, which, while more conformable to the genius of her constitution, would be a pledge of future peace and security.

§ 165. *Temporal Power of the Popes—Establishment of the States of the Church.*

I. Monumenta dominationis Pontificiae seu codex Carolinus ed. *Cenni*, Romae, 1760, 2 T. 4to. (i. e. epp. Greg. III. usque ad Hadrian I., ad Carol. Martell., Pipin., Carlmann. et Carol. M.) **Theiner*, Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis St. Sedis, Romae, 1861 sq., 3 T. fol.

II. †**Orsi*, dell' origine del dominio e della sovranità dei Romani Pontefici sopra gli Stati loro temporalmente soggetti, Rom. 1754. *Muzzarelli*, Dominio temporale del Papa, 1789. **Phillips*, Hist. of Germ., Vol. II., p. 239–253. *Savigny*, Hist. of Roman Civil Law during the Middle Ages, 2d ed. Heidelberg, 1834, Vol. I., p. 357–396, "Ravenna and Rome under the Popes and the Emperors." *Leo*, Hist. of Italy, Vol. I., p. 187–189. †**Scharpff*, Origin of the States of the Church, Freiburg, 1860. †*Brandes*, The world-wide Importance of the Creation of the States of the Church (Tübg. Quart. 1848, nro. 2). †*Schrödl*, The Vote of the Catholic World on the Necessity of the Temporal Power and Sovereignty of the Holy See, together with a Hist. of the Rise of the States of the Church, Freiburg, 1867. *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the City of Rome, etc., Vol. II., p. 304 sq. *Reumont*, ibid. Vol. II., p. 127 sq. TR. ADDS.: *Döllinger*, in the Munich Historical Annuary of 1865, p. 300 sq. Card. *Soglia*, Institutiones Juris publici et privati. Eccl. ed. 10, Boscoduci (Herzogenbusch.), Vol. I., § 42, p. 257–284.

Scharpff, who has treated the establishment of the States of the Church with great clearness and fidelity, divides the subject into *three* sections, corresponding to its three leading historical aspects. In the first of these, he treats of the gradually increasing extent of the *estates* of the Roman Church, or the *Patrimonium Petri*, down to the time of Gregory the Great; in the second, of the Papacy as the *protecting power* of Rome and of several of the Greek provinces in Italy; in the third, of the *de facto* sovereignty of the Popes, which, he says, was, under the circumstances, a *legitimate* title to *supreme civil authority*, into which it shortly developed.

We shall confine ourselves principally to a consideration of the questions involved in the last two sections.

No country suffered as much as Italy from the devastating incursions of the barbarians. In seasons of greatest danger and distress, the inhabitants, forsaken by the Greek Emperors and the *Exarchs at Ravenna*, naturally turned to the Popes for comfort and assistance; and, in matter of fact, Rome herself was saved by their courageous interference. It was *Leo the Great* who stopped and turned back Attila, at the head of the Huns, and Genseric, at the head of the Vandals. Again, it was Pope Zachary who confronted the Lombard kings Luitprand and Rachis (A. D. 743 and 750), and saved Rome from the terror of their arms. "If," says *John von Müller*, "the question be decided by natural justice, then is the Pope the rightful Lord of Rome; for, without him, Rome would not now exist."

As time went on, the *Lombards* of Upper Italy, having extended their conquests and taken possession of the duchies of *Beneventum* and *Spoleto*, spread a sense of insecurity and danger throughout the city of Rome. Hence Gregory the Great, while acting as a mediator between the Lombard Kings and the Exarchs of Ravenna, who were at war with each other, was careful to avert, as far as possible, all danger from Rome, and to provide for the prosperity of her temporal interests. By this policy of careful management, the city of Rome increased in political importance, till, with the patrimony of St. Peter, consisting of cities and towns scattered over Italy and the island of Sicily, it became a sort of *principality under the suzerainty of Byzantium*. But, when the popes *Gregory II.* and *Gregory III.* opposed the decrees of the iconoclastic emperors, the latter seized such of the papal estates as were situated in Southern Italy and Sicily, and even made an attempt to arrest the Pope himself. In the meantime, great disorders broke out in Rome and in the provinces of Italy belonging to the emperor, which the Lombard kings made every effort to turn to their own advantage. Luitprand and Rachis, after having made many conquests, marched on Rome, and were prevented from taking the city only by the energy, tact, and eloquence of Pope Zachary (A. D. 743–750), with whom they entered into a treaty of peace. The peace was of short duration. After the treaty had been broken by King *Aistulf* (Aistulphus), Pope Stephen III. (A. D. 752–757), weak and infirm, and regardless of the danger that might befall him in the country of the Lombards, set out, amid the tears of all Rome, to implore for Italy the aid and protection of Pepin. Some years previously (A. D. 741), Gregory III. had crossed the Alps on a similar mission to Charles Martel, the father of Pepin; but this prince, who governed the French monarchy under the modest title of Mayor, was too much occupied at home to think of any foreign enterprise, and while he received the Pope with respectful reverence, dismissed him without acceding to his wishes.[1] Pepin was not unmindful that Childeric III. had been deposed and he himself raised to the royal dignity by the authority of Pope Zachary (A. D. 752), and felt that it was now his duty to espouse the cause of the Father of Christendom. He received Pope Stephen with every demonstration of respect, assured him of his good will, and promised to march at the head of an army to his assistance. The Pope in turn appointed Pepin protector of the Church of Rome, under the title of *Patricius of Rome*, and anointed his son King. Pepin crossed the Alps with his army, in the company of Stephen, and having, in this and a second expedition undertaken in the year following (A. D. 755), completely overcome Aistulphus and forced him to restore the possessions and respect the rights of the Church of Rome, "*donated to St. Peter, to the Church, and to the Roman Republic*," the cities that had formerly belonged to the Greek Exarchate and to the Pentapolis (A. D. 756).[1] This "Donation," which is mentioned only in a casual way and in general terms by the most trustworthy authors, is given in detail by *Anastasius* the Librarian, who specifies the following places as included in the grant, viz: *Ravenna*, *Ariminium* (Rimini), *Pisaurum* (Pesaro), *Concha* (which has long since ceased to exist), *Fanum* (Fano), *Cesinae* (Cesena), *Sinogallia* (Sinigaglia), *Aesium* (Jesi), *Forum Pompilii* (Forumpopuli), *Forum Livii* (Forlì) with the castle of Sassubium, *Montefeltri*, *Acerres* (not identified), *Agiomonte* (Monte Maggio, near San Marino), *Mons Lucati* (Monte Luco), *Serra*, *Castrum St. Marini*, *Bobium* (Bobbio), *Orbino*, *Gallis* (Cagli), *Lucioli* (Lucerlo), *Eugubio* (Gubbio), *Comiaclum* (Comachio), and *Civitas Narniensis* (Narni). Anastasius also adds: "Fulrad, Abbot of St. Denys and Plenipotentiary of Pepin, visited all the cities enumerated, in the company of the Lombard deputies, from whom he received the keys of each place, and laid them on the tomb of St. Peter."[2]

---

[1] Cf. *John von Müller*, Journeys of the Popes, and *Papencordt*, Hist. of the City of Rome, p. 80 sq.

The Greek emperor, Constantine Copronymus, a persecutor of the Church, desirous of turning the Frankish victories to his own profit, demanded, through his embassadors, the restitution of all the territory previously taken from him by the Lombards. But to this demand Pepin refused to accede. "*The Franks*," said he, "*have not shed their blood for the Greeks, but for St. Peter and the salvation of their own souls. Neither will I break my word for any worldly consideration.*" The inhabitants of these countries, having been long accustomed to regard the Pope as their rightful sovereign and faithful guardian, considered that Pepin, in making this grant, had done no more than *restore* to the Pope what had been unlawfully taken from him.[1] The Romans furthermore promised Pepin that for the future they would obey the Pope as their king.[2]

---

[1] Vide *Theiner*, "Codex diplomaticus dominii S. S. Romae, 1861, and *Soglia*, l. l., p. 258. (Tr.)

[2] The deed of "Donation" is lost, but *Anastasius* states positively that he saw the document. The extent of territory included in the "Donation" is still greater according to *Justinus Fontani:* Istoria del Dominio temporale della Sede Apostolica del Ducato di Parma e Piacenza, Rome, 1720. Conf. *Muratori*, Annali d'Italia, T. IV., p. 310 sq., *ejusdem* antiquitates Ital. med. aev., T. I., p. 64 sq., V. 790; *Sabbathier*, Essai hist. crit. sur l'origine de la puissance temporelle des Papes, à la Haye, 1765, 4to.

After the death of Pepin, Desiderius, king of the Lombards, made another attempt to get possession of Rome and the Exarchate. To avert the threatened danger, an appeal for aid was made to *Charlemagne* by Pope Hadrian I. (A. D. 772–795). This prince responded to the appeal of Hadrian with as much alacrity as his father had to that of Stephen, and, having crossed the Alps and subdued the Lombards, marched to Rome, which he entered with the permission of the Pope, and confirmed the donation of Pepin, to which he added some *provinces in Northern and Central Italy*, among which were the island of *Corsica* and the duchies of *Benevento* and *Spoleto*.[3] But of these additional gifts of Charlemagne, the Pope retained possession only of the Exarchate and the duchies of Rome and Spoleto.[1] After the capture of Desid-

---

[1] Cf. *Stephan.* III. ep. ad Domin. Pipinum Regem an. 754: Propria vestra voluntate per *donationis* paginam beato Petro sanctaeque Dei ecclesiae et reipublicae, civitates et loca *restituenda* confirmastis (*Cenni*, l. c., p. 75). *Annal. Fuldens.* Haistulfum—res St. Petri reddere sacramento constrinxit. See *Orsi*, l. c., Cap. 6, p. 101 sq.

[2] Ep. Populi Senatusque Rom. ad Domin. Pipin. Reg.: At vero in ipsis vestris mellifluis apicibus nos salutaris providentia vestra et *ammonere praecellentia vestra studuit, firmos nos ac fideles permanere debere erga Beat. Petrum, principem Apostolorum*, et sanctam Dei ecclesiam et circa beatissimum et evangelicum spiritalem patrem vestrum a Deo decretum Dominum nostrum Paulum Summum Pontificem et universalem Papam, etc. (*Cenni*, l. c., p. 141.)

[3] There is no positive proof that any *addition* was ever made to the first "Donation." The only documents bearing directly on the subject are the account given by Anastasius, which was written a century after the transaction is said to have taken place, and *Codex Carolinus;* but these two instruments contradict each other. Cf. *de Marca*, de Concordia Sacerd. et Imper. III. 11.—*Mock*, de Donatione a Carolo M., etc., Monast. 1861.

The words of Pope Hadrian I., which follow, are still more remarkable. They are addressed to Charlemagne, and some have maintained that they contain an appeal to a *donation* supposed to have been made by *Constantine the Great* to Pope Sylvester: "Et sicut temporibus St. Sylvestri a piissimo Const. M. imp. per ejus *largitatem Romana Ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et potestatem in his Hesperiae partibus largiri dignatus est*—ecce novus christianissimus Constantinus imperator his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctae eccles. Apostolorum principis Petri largiri dignatus est. Sed et cuncta alia, quae per diversos imperatores, Patricios etiam et alios Deum timentes pro eorum animae mercede et venia delictorum in partibus Tusciae, Spoleto seu Benevento atque Corsica.

---

simul et Sabinensi patrimonia Petro Apostolo concessa sunt, et—vestris temporibus *restituantur*." (Cod. Carolin., T. I., p. 352.)

While *Muratori*, in his History of Italy, only ventured to say that the words printed in italics *seemingly* contain an *allusion* to a supposed donation of Constantine, later historians have boldly asserted that they express a plain and undeniable *fact*.

Döllinger, referring to these words, in his *Papal Fables*, p. 76, says: "It is quite plain, and may be easily proven by comparison of analogous expressions, that these words were only intended to convey the idea that Constantine *exalted* the Roman Church by his munificence, and conferred upon her certain *grants* of *power* in these countries of the West."

Cf. the Donation of Constantine; Review of *Döllinger's* Papal Fables of the Middle Ages, Civiltà Cattolica, German translation, Mentz, 1866, p. 21 et sq.

[1] Even down to the present day, many doubts of a very different and sometimes ingenuous character have been raised as to the justice of this donation. Cf. *Phillips*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 248. In addition to the words of John von Müller, given in the text, we will add the remarkable and weighty passage from *Savigny*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 361:

"This affair can not be regarded as an usurpation of the rights of the Eastern Emperor, who was himself but an usurper in Italy. For it should not be forgotten that the Greeks, instead of wishing to restore this half of the empire, which they had already lost, to its former condition, treated Italy as a conquered province and with excessive harshness, refusing to recognize her ancient dignity, or to restore her former constitution and power. Such being the condition of affairs, the assertion that the Frankish king exercised a sort of suzerainty over this country is simply inadmissible. The truth is, the Pope was himself the representative of an authority which rested on an entirely independent title," etc.

Charles A. Menzel, Hist. of the Germans, Book III., chap. 16, Vol. I., p. 448, says: "It is impossible either to question the right or to doubt the justice of the donation. For, from the time that Belisarius and Narses conquered Italy, this country had never been considered by the court of Constantinople as part of the empire, or one of the seats of government, but, on the contrary, had been regarded as a conquered province. On what ground, then, could the tyrants of the East claim back conquests which had already passed into other hands, and which they could neither govern nor defend? Judging from the tone of certain modern historians, it would seem that, by some Providential arrangement, all the countries of Europe, as far as the Rhine and the Danube, should be forever subject to the Byzantine yoke, and that any attempt to get rid of this yoke would be an unpardonable sin. Rome accomplished under her bishops what other nations accomplished under their kings. She seized a favorable moment to shake off the yoke of a stranger, and sunder unnatural relations. There is neither a European prince nor people able to advance claims to the possession of territory stronger than those of Rome; she had asserted her freedom, and erius, Charlemagne abolished the kingdom of the Lombards and assumed the title of *King of the Franks and Lombards.*

In the year 800, during the pontificate of Leo III. (A. D. 795–816), Charlemagne came to Rome, and, on Christmas day, placed upon the tomb of St. Peter the "*Donation*" made by his father and increased by himself, and received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope. Thus was laid the foundation of an institution which has no parallel in history, but which was hinted at, centuries before, by Pope Gelasius.[1]

§ 166. *Foundation of the Christian German or Restoration of the Roman Empire of the West.*

Phillips, Hist. of Germ., Vol. II., §§ 47, 48: Relation of the Pope with the Emperor, p. 253 sq. *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Times of the German Emperors, Vol. I., 2d ed., p. 121 sq. *Ficker*, The German Empire, in its Universal and National Relations, Innsbr. 1861. *Niehues*, Hist. of the Relations between the Empire and the Papacy, Münster, 1863, Vol. I., p. 545–593. "*What is the Empire?*" (Hist. Polit. Papers, Vol. 31, p. 665–704.) *Döllinger*, Exit of the Old Empire in the West (Munich Hist. Annuary, for 1865). †*Kampschulte*, Hist. of the Middle Ages, Bonn, 1864.

The establishment of the Germano-Roman Empire was not the result of any well-conceived plan devised by man, but

---

maintained it for a century. Besides this unimpeachable title, there is still another, not indeed of equal importance, but still perfectly valid, viz., the title of retaliation. The Greek Emperor had seized the estates of the Church situated in Lower Italy, and, having done so, the Pope could not refuse to accept them as an indemnification for what he had lost."

The impartial testimony of *Herder* confirms the above: "Were all the emperors, kings, princes, and cavaliers of Christendom obliged to make good the claims by which they rose to power, then might the man (the Pope) wearing the triple crown and adored at Rome, borne aloft upon the shoulders of peaceable priests, bless them, and say: 'Without me, you would not be what you are.' The Popes have preserved antiquity, and Rome should remain the peaceful sanctuary of the precious treasures of the past." (Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind, Stuttg. 1827 et seq., in 16 Parts, Vol. IV., p. 108.)

Even *Napoleon I.*, when a prisoner on the island of St. Helena, said of the States of the Church: "*Ages have called them into existence, and it is a blessing that they have done so.*"

Pius IX., in a letter written lately to the Bishop of Würzburg, made this straightforward and irrefragable statement: "It is well known to all that the Bishops of Rome came into possession of their temporal power by *disposition of Divine Providence*, to the end that they might exercise the *functions of thetr office more effectually, and without hindrance, in all countries.*"

[1] See Vol. I., p. 649.

rather the consequence of a series of *providential circumstances*. This view seems to be borne out by its subsequent history and the great and exceptional influence it exercised upon succeeding events. The assertion advanced by certain authors, that the establishment of this empire consisted in simply *transferring* to the West the imperial dignity of the East, can not be sustained,[1] because the rights and prerogatives of the Greek emperors were in no sense impaired by the elevation of Charlemagne. It was neither more nor less than a *restoration* of the Western Empire; and, though a *purely political institution*, possessed characteristics *peculiar to itself.*

Pope Stephen had bestowed upon Pepin the title of *Patricius* or *Protector of the Roman Church*,[2] but when the latter was once in the full exercise of the functions which that title implied, the transition to the more imposing name of "*Emperor*" was easy and natural. Hence Leo III. actually bestowed the imperial crown upon Charles, on Christmas day, in the year 800, amid the joyful acclamations of the people, who cried out: "*Long life and success to the good Charles Augustus, the pacific Emperor of the Romans, whom God has crowned.*" The Pope, having anointed his forehead with holy oil, was the first to pay homage to the new emperor.

The august ceremony did not, indeed, confer upon the emperor any new grant of power, but it added a fresh lustre and a divine sanction to his authority. This act simply restored the relations which had existed between the Pope and the Emperor in the days of Theodosius. Although established on quite a different basis, and with a very different scope,[3] still everything—even the coins, seals, and inscriptions—proclaimed that it was only a *restoration of the Western Empire* (Renovatio Imperii). Charlemagne frequently and publicly avowed that this sudden elevation was a surprise to him, and that he was at a loss to account for it; but he soon came to regard it as *a providence of God*, carried into effect by the the visible Head of the Church.[1]

---

[1] *Bellarminus*, S. J., De translatione (?) imperii a Graecis ad Francos advers. Flacium Illyr., libb. III., Antv. 1589, and in opp. omn. Even *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 153, says: "The empire, the supreme authority of which was *transferred* to Charlemagne, was one which united the *eastern* and western parts of the Roman Empire," etc. (Tr.)

[2] *Patricius*, i. e. as *Savigny* says in his Hist. of Roman Law in the M. A., Vol. I., p. 360, a lieutenant or governor with an independent power, such as had hitherto been exercised by the exarch of Ravenna. See *Palma*, prael. h. e., T. II., c. VII., p. 59–68, "De Romano Patriciatu." *Gregorovius*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II., p. 503–513.

[3] Cf. *Pagii* critica in annal. Baronii ad a. 800, and *ab Ekhart*, Francia orient., T. II., p. 7.

The establishment of the Western Empire put an end to the conflicts of the migratory Germanic tribes, and served as the *keystone* of the great political fabric into which the Germanic States were *consolidated.* Each of the Germanic nations, possessing individual and well-defined traits of character, and holding as a political axiom the principle that every commonwealth should be an outgrowth and expression of these distinctive traits, would consent to no system of centralization, if the empire representing such did not itself recognize some *superior and universal power*, which might form a point of contact and a center of union for all. They all recognized the Church as such, and hence the Western Empire, being established on a thoroughly Christian basis, was called "*The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.*" The belief of the ancient Romans, that their empire was destined to endure for all time and bring all the nations of the world under *one* law, was analogous to the promise contained in the Gospel, that all the followers of Christ should be gathered into *one* fold and under *one* Shepherd.

The object, therefore, of the Church in establishing the empire, was to unite all nations by the one bond of Christian fellowship, and she impressed upon the mind of the Emperor the conviction that he was called of God to act as mediator and pacificator among all the States of Christendom. Hence, owing to the peculiar and intimate relations of the Emperor to the Church, and, in virtue of the command of Christ,[2] he had, in a certain sense, *a duty to bring the Pagan States*

---

[1] It is therefore Charles called himself Carolus, *divino nutu* coronatus, Romanum gerens imperium, serenissimus Augustus. Capit. addit. ad leg. Longobard. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 247); again, a *Deo Coronatus.* (*Baluz.*, T. I., pp. 341, 345.)

[2] Mat. xxviii 18.

of the West[1] *within the limits of his authority*, that they might in this way be converted to Christianity. Charlemagne, too, seems to have been fully impressed with this great idea, and to have endeavored to carry it into effect by forming a family alliance with the imperial house of the East, which he foresaw would bring all the kingdoms of the earth within the limits of his empire. It was never expected, however, that this *universal empire* (Imperium mundi) should confer upon him actual territorial jurisdiction, but only a *supremacy of honor and authority* over all other sovereigns. On the other hand, it was a duty incumbent on him, above all other princes, to honor and *defend the Church*, to maintain her rights and prerogatives, and to set an example of fidelity to other sovereigns. Hence, Charlemagne, inspired with a thoroughly Christian sentiment, styled himself the *devoted defender and humble protector of the Holy Church* and of the *Apostolic Roman See*.[2] Still, it should be borne in mind that neither was subject to the other, but that their relations were mutually *co-ordinate*, each rendering and receiving homage in his own sphere, and hence they gave each other the kiss on the mouth, an ancient form of salutation (adoration), expressive of mutual homage. The *oath of fealty* (fidelitas), therefore, which the Emperor took to the Pope, as the Head of the Church, was simply a solemn expression of respect and reverence to his person, and was precisely the same in character as that taken by the Pope to the Emperor. Moreover, the authority of the Pope over Rome and the States of the Church, as they had been established during the course of the eighth century, remained, after the coronation of Charlemagne, just what it had been before—neither greater nor less. But the Pope, having acknowledged Charlemagne as supreme temporal ruler, was obliged, *as sovereign of the States of the Church*, equally with all other secular princes, to recognize the imperial supremacy of the Emperor over Rome and the Roman States. Apart from this general supervision of the interests of the Church, there was still a more particular sense in which the Emperor might take upon him to look after her concerns; for, being Patricius of Rome, or defender and guardian of the Church's political and secular rights, he might exercise a certain immediate jurisdiction in Rome. Difficulties having shortly arisen between the two, in consequence of the excessive claims of each, it became necessary to define more precisely the limits of their respective rights. This, in fact, was no more than a dictate of prudence; for, *being the representatives of divine authority*, and commissioned to work in harmony, *in parallel lines of action*—the one for the corporal, the other for the spiritual welfare of Christian nations—mutually sustaining and aiding each other in the great work of leading mankind on to its appointed destiny, it was but natural that, before entering upon the duties of their respective offices,[1] *they should reciprocally recognize and be ready to respect each other's rights.*

---

[1] Conf. *Eichhorn*, Hist. of the German States and their Laws, Vol. I., § 36.

[2] Ego Carolus gratia Dei ejusque misericordia donante Rex et rector regni Francorum et *devotus sanctae ecclesiae defensor humilisque adjutor*, in the praefatio Capitular., lib. I. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 475.) In like manner do the bishops, assembled at Mentz (813), address him thus: Gloriosissimo et christianissimo Imp. Carol. Aug. *verae religionis rectori ac defensori St. Dei ecclesiae*, etc. (*Harzheim.*, T. I., p. 405.) Cf. capitulum de honoranda sede apostolica a. 801: In *memoriam beati Petri Apostoli honoremus sanctam Rom. et apostol. sedem*, ut quae nobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis, esse debeat magistra ecclesiasticae rationis. Quare servanda est cum mansuetudine humilitas, ut licet vix ferendum ab illa sancta sede imponatur jugum, feramus et pia devotione toleremus. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 255.)

---

[1] The following are the words of the Council of Paris, held A. D. 829, capitular. lib. V., cap. 319: Principaliter itaque St. Dei ecclesiae corpus in duas eximias personas: in sacerdotalem videlicet et regalem, sicut a SS. Patribus traditum accepimus, divisum esse novimus. De qua re *Gelasius*, Rom. Sedis venerab. Episcopus, ad Anastasium Imperat. ita scribit: duae sunt quippe imperatrices augustae, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur: *auctoritas sacrata Pontificum* et *regalis potestas*, in quibus tanto gravius pondus est Sacerdotum, quanto etiam pro ipsis Regibus hominum in divino reddituri sunt examine rationem. (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 893. *Mansi*, T. VIII., p. 31. Cf. our Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 649.) Fulgentius quoque in libro de veritate praedest. et gratiae ita scribit, lib. II., c. 22: Quantum pertinet ad hujus temporis vitam, in ecclesia nemo Pontifice potior et in saeculo christiano Imperatore nemo celsior invenitur. (Max. bibl. T. IX., p. 247; also *Baluz.*, T. I., p. 595, and T. II., p. 807 sq.) Although this passage, in its partial application, be in fact *pseudo-Isidorian*, still it contains nothing but what was then the *generally received view*. The words of the epitaph written by Charlemagne for Pope Hadrian are very significant:

Nomina jungo simul titulis, Clarissime, nostra:
Hadrianus, Carolus, Rex ego, tuque Pater.

The Pope, having invested Charlemagne with the imperial dignity, and sanctioned his universal supremacy in the eyes of the Christian world, reserved to himself, for the future, the *right of crowning Christian emperors.* The Emperor, on the other hand, in virtue of the alliance between the Church and the Empire, and, by the authority of precedents, obtained the privilege of confirming the election of the Head of the Church.

CHAPTER III.

RELIGIOUS LIFE—THE CLERGY—DISCIPLINE.

†*Ozanam*, Establishment of Christianity in Germany, and the moral and spiritual Education of the Germans. Transl. from the French into German, Munich, 1845; in his Oeuvres complètes, 8 vols., Paris, 1855–1856, Vol. IV. (Tr.)

§ 167. *Religious Life.*

To give an idea of the perfection to which the evangelical counsels were carried during this epoch, it will be sufficient to enumerate a few of the glorious names which history has enshrined and the Church holds in honor. These are Patrick, Columba, Augustine, Columbanus, Gall, Severin, Valentine, Kilian, Emmeram, Rupert, Corbinian, Boniface, Ludger, Willehad, Viho, and Hadumar, among missionaries and national apostles; and among those holy monks and abbots who spent their lives in the retirement of their monasteries, training up hosts of saintly and devoted souls, through whose labors and influence the spirit of true religious life and solid piety was infused into the masses of the people, the great names of Gregory of Utrecht, Sturm of Fulda, Venerable Bede, and many others, deserve honorable mention.

But the corruption prevalent among men of every condition and rank, from kings—and notably those of the Merovingian dynasty—down to the meanest of their subjects, forms a shocking and repulsive contrast, when placed side by side with this life of evangelical perfection. The account of it which has come down to us from the pen of *Gregory of Tours* is simply startling.[1] But between these two extremes of perfection and profligacy, there is a third phase, representing the every-day life of the German people. These were still full of the strong vigor of youth, enthusiastic and warlike, passionately fond of the pleasures of Pagan feasts and given to idolatry, obstinately attached to their ancient customs and the votaries of magic, divination, necromancy, and other superstitious and inhuman practices.

---

[1] *Löbell*, Gregory of Tours and his Age, Lps. 1839. *Kries*, de Gregorii Turon. vita et scriptis. Vratisl. 1848.

But the Church, in the meantime, not forgetting her holy mission, went about her work as became the Spouse of Christ, dispensing her treasures of divine grace, teaching her children to be virtuous, sending her missionaries into every land to instruct, to consecrate, and to direct, making herself all things to all men, that she might gain all and ennoble all. She alone was capable of preserving a sense of the true and the good in these barbarous people, so abruptly brought into contact with a corrupt and an effete civilization. But, while possessing this strong but vague and undeveloped sense of the true, their mental habits were so out of harmony with the methods of Christian thought, that they were at first incapable of receiving more than the most elementary and meager Gospel-teaching concerning the *existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the everlasting happiness of Heaven, and the endless torments of hell.* The great and essential truths of Christianity, such as the doctrine of justification in Jesus Christ, the doctrine of grace, and the counsels of Christian perfection, were quite beyond and above the comprehension of the bulk of the people. The tendency in this people to set a great value on the things of earth, and to judge of everything as it appeared to the senses, will sufficiently account for their desire to see the Head of the Church and their bishops the equals of secular[1] princes, and for the sacrifices which they were willing to make to carry this desire into effect. The Church therefore saw herself obliged either to exercise a certain condescension and forbearance in dealing with the deeply seated Pagan prejudices of these rude people, or to give up altogether their education and their future. This consideration will also sufficiently explain why, in spite of many and emphatic remonstrances, the Church was unable to eradicate at once the Pagan trials by ordeal, or, as they were called, *judgments of God.* She at first exerted her influence and authority to abolish such of the ordeals as could not be practiced without *imminent danger to the life* of the contestants, by *substituting the oath* in their stead wherever possible. The ceremony of taking the oath was surrounded with circumstances at once impressive and solemn. It was performed in *church*[1] and accompanied with religious rites; and the innocence of the person on trial was attested by seven sworn witnesses or *compurgators* (the "septima manus" or "conjuratores"), taken from his immediate neighbors and bearing reputations of unimpeachable honesty.

---

[1] There is a very characteristic example of this popular prejudice in favor of a showy exterior, even as late as the twelfth century. The Spanish priest *Bernhard,* who had been sent as a missionary into Pomerania, was treated with great disrespect by the inhabitants because of his humble and unprepossessing exterior. They could not conceive why the Lord of Heaven and earth should be pleased to have a beggar as His representative.

John von Müller, speaking on the same subject, says very justly: "Barbarians are quite incapable of appreciating what does not fall within the province of the senses. Their bishops, therefore, should display a certain magnificence, and their solitaries be distinguished by deeds of extraordinary power, if they would exert any influence over them." (Hist. of Switzerland, Stuttg. 1832, 16mo, Pt. I., p. 138.)

But wherever it was impossible either to abolish ordeals or substitute in their stead other modes of trial, the Church assumed the charge of conducting them, and, following the precedent of St. Peter,[2] entered upon them only after having commended the cause of the accused to God in solemn *prayer.* So universal was the practice of trial by ordeal, that provisions for it were incorporated among the laws of Charlemagne—a circumstance which rendered its abolition a long and difficult task.[3]

---

[1] Omne sacramentum in ecclesia juretur, is enjoined by a *capitulare* of the year 744, c. 14. On the so-called *cojurers* as a means of proving anything in favor of the accused, see *Harzheim*, Conc. Germ., T. I., p. 366.

[2] Acts i. 24.

[3] These *ordeals* or judgments of God (from the ancient German *or*, great, and *dele* or *daele*, part, portion, lot, or deal, = German *Urtheil*) are to be found among all nations. They were practiced among the Greeks and Romans, in China, Japan, and East India, but particularly among the *Germans*, of whom *Tacitus* (German., c. 10) says: "Auspicia sortesque ut qui maxime observant," etc. These people were so attached to them that it seemed almost impossible to correct the abuse. Hence, *Luitprand*, King of Lombardy, declared: "Incerti sumus de judiciis Dei, et multos audivimus per puguam sine justitia causam

§ 168. *The Clergy—Their Canonical Life—The Monks.*

Thomassini Vet. et nova eccl. Disc., Pt. I., lib. III., c. 2-9.—†*August. Theiner*, Hist. of Eccl. Educational Institutions, p. 20-49. *Chrodegangi* regula, in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 313 sq.; in *Harzheim*, T. I., p. 96; in *Walter*, Fontes juris eccl., p. 21-46. Conf. *Pauli* Diac. gesta episcopor. Metens. (*Pertz*, T. II., p. 267 sq.) *Friedrich*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. II., p. 114-147. †*Ginzel*, The Canonical Life of the Clergy, Ratisb. 1851.

To reform the coarse habits and vulgar manners of the Germans required a clergy at once able, learned, and faithful. *Gregory* the *Great* was the first to undertake the task of

---

suam perdere; *sed propter consuetudinem gentis nostrae legem impiam vitare non possumus.*"

The judgments of God were undoubtedly based on the belief that there existed a moral order in the universe; and on the conviction that God would interfere, if necessary, to declare the guilt or innocence of the one on trial. And the stronger the faith of individuals and of whole nations in the power and presence of God, the more will they be inclined to appeal *directly to Him to decide* what can not be ascertained by any other means. The judgments of God gave rise to *many abuses* and *superstitions;* but undoubtedly the most dangerous of these was the practice of *presumptuously challenging* or *trying* God, by calling upon Him to manifest Himself by some external sign, and to decide in the most trivial affairs, simply because it was the will of man that He should do so. Cf. Isaias vii. 12.

Neither is it unlikely that the Germans may have appealed to—1. *Holy Writ*, in defense of their Pagan practice, as there are *certain passages*, both of the Old and New Testaments, which seemingly countenance it. Such are those in which God is represented as *immediately* declaring His judgment, manifesting His pleasure or displeasure, conferring reward or inflicting punishment, when the circumstances are of sufficient importance to warrant this gracious interference. There are, for example, the passages which relate to the *sacrifice of Abel and Cain* (Gen. iv. 4); to the *Flood* (Gen. vii.); to the *destruction of Sodom* (Gen. xix.); to the sudden *punishment of Core*, *Dathan*, and *Abiron* (Numb. xvi.), and of *Ananias* and *Saphira* (Acts v. 1);—or in which the *decision of God* is asked in *prayer*, as, for example, where instructions are given to apply the so-called *water of jealousy* (Numb. v. 12, 31); in the *election of an Apostle* to take the place of Judas (Acts i. 15-25); and many similar passages. Again, 2. The *great number of miracles*, which always accompany the preaching of the Gospel and the introduction of Christianity into heathen lands, and which were of great frequency during the agitated period of the migrations, tended to familiarize men's minds with the manifestations of Divine power, and to give them a sort of assurance that God would interfere to make known the guilt or innocence of those who appealed to Him in the ordeal.

They failed, however, to observe an important distinction between the mode of Divine manifestations as related in Holy Writ, and as shown forth in miratraining a clergy of this character and standard. Having so changed and adapted his ancestral palace as to make it serve at once the purpose of a monastery and a seminary, he gathered about him a number of generous souls—some of whom were still in the flower of youth, and longed for the happiness of serving the altar of God; while others, already grown gray in the service of the Church, desired to close their lives under a religious rule, and divide their last days between intellectual labors, watching, and the exercises of a religious life.

From this nursery of learning and piety came forth, among others, *Augustine* and *Mellitus*, the apostles of Great Britain, who founded in that island institutions closely resembling that of Gregory. These monastic institutions, which rapidly

---

cles, and that, according to which He was supposed to act in ordeals. In the first instance, He made known his pleasure, *not because it was man's will* that He should do so, but *His own*, or because He graciously deigned to *hear and answer a fervent prayer;* in the second, He was expected to render a decision, not in answer to a prayer, or because it pleased Him to do so, but simply at the *bidding of man.*

As has been said above, the Church did *now and then* tolerate trial by ordeal, but always in humble submission to the will of God, and in the sense just stated. She would not have tolerated this manner of trial at all, had it not been impossible to abolish the practice at once. Pope Gregory the Great and Nicholas I., Agobard (Archbishop of Lyons), and Atto of Vercelli, and many councils, made most strenuous, but ineffectual, exertions to have the judgments of God discontinued. So general was the practice of settling the question of guilt or innocence by this method, that we find it recommended in a Frankish Capitulary of the year 809: "Ut omnes judicio Dei credant absque dubitatione." (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 332.)

The forms of ordeal tolerated were those of lots, of hot and cold water, and of the cross; the walking barefoot over a number of red-hot plowshares, and the carrying of a red-hot iron in the hands; the taking of the blessed morsel, and the reception of the Eucharist; the judgment of the bier, etc. (Cf. *du Fresne*, Glossarium, s. v. Sors Sanctorum, Campiones, etc.)

The Synod of Valence, A. D. 855, c. 12, reprobates in emphatic language the *duel* as a form of ordeal: "Iniquissima ac detestabilis quarundam saecularium legum."

The *rules of the Church*, setting forth the permissible forms of trial by ordeal, may be found in the "Ordo diffusior probandi homines de crimine suspectos per ignitos vomeres, candens ferrum, aquam ferventem seu frigidam, in *Pez*, Thesaurus anecdotorum, T. II., p. 2, and in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 353. Their vindication by *Hincmar* of Rheims, in his opp. T. II., p. 676. Conf. *Phillips*, Hist. of Germ., Vol. I., p. 246–267. *Dasu*, Studies on the Hist. of the German Ordeals, Munich, 1857.

spread throughout *England*,[1] diffused the light of learning and holiness among the inhabitants of the districts in which they were set up, and, gradually extending their influence, were instrumental in bringing the same blessings upon the continent of Europe.

At the request of many bishops, and in obedience to a number of synodal decrees, many seminaries were established in *Spain* during the course of the sixth century. Those of France and Germany were established by English missionaries, of whom *St. Boniface* was, beyond all question, the most active, energetic, and efficient. The biographer of *St. Solus* (c. A. D. 970) says that it is the peculiar happiness of the College of St. Boniface to have been the nursery "whence went forth the flower of the episcopacy, the priesthood and the diaconate." These efforts toward the formation of a good clergy were fully entered into and ably seconded by *Chrodegang*, Bishop of Metz (c. A. D. 760). In order to exercise a more direct influence upon the studies and morals of his clergy, this bishop, following the example of St. Augustine, and in obedience to the instructions of the fourth Council of Toledo, assembled them about his cathedral church and subjected them to the rules and observances of *canonical life*. Ecclesiastics who led this sort of life, and who were on this account called *canonici*, were under the immediate supervision of the bishops, recited the office in choir, devoted themselves to the study of science, ate in the same dining-room, and slept in a common dormitory. As a rule, the bishop alone provided for their support. This manner of life spread rapidly throughout France, Germany, and Italy, where it was adopted, not alone by the clergy of cathedral churches, but by those of the larger parishes also—a fact which accounts for the origin of *collegiate churches*. But the clergy, in spite of these noble efforts and auspicious beginnings, continued, in many instances, the slaves of the coarse morals of the age. Bishops and priests, instead of devoting themselves to the duties of their state and looking after the salvation of their flocks, might be seen engaged in the profession of arms, indulging in the pleasures of the chase, and lending the authority of their presence to undignified farces and unbecoming spectacles. Complaints grew more frequent, prohibitions more numerous and of less avail. The *ordinationes absolutae*, or the taking of orders with the understanding that an ecclesiastical benefice, or a place at some church, would not be required—a practice contrary to the letter and spirit of the ancient canons—now gave occasion to the most deplorable scandals. A portion of the clergy, in some countries, were so utterly destitute of the very elements of learning and general culture that it was found necessary to reduce the standard of fitness for taking orders to the lowest possible requirements. *The standard had fallen so low*, at one time, that the candidate for orders was only required to recite from memory the "Apostles' Creed," the "Our Father," and the formulae used in the administration of the Sacraments, and to be able to give a translation and an explanation of these prayers in the vulgar tongue.[1]

---

[1] Of all the monasteries in England, *Venerable Bede* (His. Eccl. Anglor., lib. III., c. 2) bestows special praise on that of *Bangor*, which, at the opening of the seventh century, contained twelve hundred monks.

Some, destitute of every qualification which could recommend them as fit candidates for the ecclesiastical state, and still desirous of coming into possession of the lucrative positions within the gift of the Church, had recourse to more dishonorable means to accomplish their ends, and purchased by bribery what they could not reach by merit. Having risen to wealth and position by *simony*,[2] their after-life was of a piece with this sacrilegeous dishonesty, and stained with the sins of immorality and *concubinage*.[3] The theory maintained in the seventeenth century by the Presbyterians, in a controversy with the Episcopalians, that the *Culdean* priests or canons rejected clerical celibacy, has been proved to have no foundation in history, and is equally at variance with Holy Scripture and the practice of the Church of Rome.[1]

---

[1] *Conc. Cloveshov.* a. 747, can. 10 (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 1455; *Mansi*, T. XII., p. 398) capitul. a. 789, c. 68 (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 172). Conf. responsa Stephan. II. in *Harduin*, T. III., p. 1987, can. 13, 14.

[2] Even Gregory the Great had occasion to take measures for the suppression of this practice, epp. lib. XI., ep. 60, Theodeberto regi Francorum: Itaque Excellentia vestra Dei nostri mandatis inhaerens, studium ad congregandam Synodum pro sua mercede adhibere dignetur, ut omne a sacerdotibus corporale vitium et *simoniaca haeresis*, quae prima in ecclesiis iniqua ambitione surrexit, potestatis vestrae imminente censura, concilii definitione tollatur, et abscissa radicitus amputetur: ne si plus illic *aurum* quam Deus diligitur, etc. (opp. T. II., p. 1146.) Conf. epp. lib. XI., ep. 61, 63.

[3] *Gregor. M.* epp. lib. IX., ep. 106 (T. II., pp. 1010, 1011). Capitulare I. a. 802, cap. 24 (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 264).

Charlemagne, conceiving it to be his paramount duty to raise the standard of education and the tone of morality among the clergy, who should be the salt of the earth and the light of the world, took counsel of the ecclesiastical authorities, and, *with their advice and concurrence*, enacted severe laws for the suppression of clerical disorders;[2] taking special care himself to do nothing which might be regarded as an infringement of the already existing statutes. Thus, for example, though he had passed a decree, at the Diet of Aix-la-Chapelle (A. D. 802), prescribing the manner of proceeding against accused ecclesiastics, having afterward learned that Pope Gregory II. had already given instructions relative to the same matter, he at once withdrew his own decree, and, at the following Diet of Worms, declared that the case was beyond his competency, and that he placed it entirely in the hands of the bishops.

In order the better to provide for the spiritual wants of his people, he abolished the defective and falsified collection of homilies then in use, and commissioned *Paul the Deacon* to compile another,[3] from the writings of St. Ambrose and St.

---

[1] Cf. *Friedrich*, Vol. II., p. 135 sq. Also, the account of the literature given there.

[2] Many of the Capitularies begin with one of the following clauses: Apostolicae sedis hortatione; Monente Pontifice; Ex praecepto Pontificis. The following is the prohibition against hunting, capitul. a. 769, c. 3: Omnibus servis Dei venationes et sylvaticas vagationes cum canibus, et ut accipitres et falcones non habeant, interdicimus. (*Baluz.*, T. I., pp. 135, 136.) Capitul. a. 802, c. 19. And the Cap. of the year 769, c. 1, is directed against carrying arms and engaging in war. Against plays, see *Lorentz's* Life of Alcuin, p. 150.

[3] The collection of Homilies (Homiliarium) was first printed at Spire, A. D. 1482; again at Basle, A. D. 1493. Charlemagne says, in the Preface: Curae nobis est, ut ecclesiarum nostrarum ad meliora semper proficiat status, obliteratam paene literarum reparare satagimus officinam, et ad pernoscendam sacrorum librorum studia nostro etiam quod possumus invitare exemplo. Inter quae jam pridem universos V. ac N. T. libros, librariorum imperitia depravatos, ad amussim correximus. Conf. *Ranke's* Hist. of the *Homiliarium* of Charlemagne, Studies and Criticisms, year 1855, p. 382–396.

Jerome, St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, St. Leo and St. Gregory the Great. These homilies were intended to serve both as a resource for the less educated among the clergy, and as *models* for the more talented and cultivated. But the strictness with which he required the clergy to observe the so-called "*Capitulary of Interrogation*" contributed, perhaps, more than anything else, to remind them of their august state, and to impress upon them a proper sense of their exalted duties.[1] He, too, was chiefly instrumental in having the *five great councils* convoked, which assembled, almost simultaneously (A. D. 813), at the cities of Arles, Rheims, Mentz, Tours, and Châlons-sur-Saône. The canons of these councils, which did so much toward correcting the abuses and elevating the moral tone of the clergy, were confirmed by a Capitulary passed at the Diet of Aix-la-Chapelle. Finally, Charlemagne, having a high esteem of the manner of life introduced by Chrodegang, commanded that all ecclesiastics should be either monks or canons.[2] His son, Louis, was equally zealous for the observance of the same rule of life, and, at the *Council of Aix-la-Chapelle* (A. D. 816), labored to introduce community life among the clergy everywhere throughout the Frankish Empire. This he did to destroy that condition of servile dependence which marked the relations of the lower clergy to their bishops, the latter of whom conducted themselves more like political masters than fatherly pastors.

The *monks* of this epoch were, in truth, the propagators of Christianity, the dispensers of its blessings, the *pioneers of civilization*, the instructors of the people, and the guardians and fosterers of science. If, in addition to this, we contrast their life of austerity, their zeal, and their works of charity with the effeminacy and dissoluteness of the secular clergy, we shall be at no loss to account for the feelings of respect, reverence, and love with which the people regarded them, or for the abundant liberality of which they were the object. Princes bestowed upon them considerable tracts of land in fief, and protected these gifts against pillage by stringent laws. Popes, too, conceded to them extraordinary privileges and immunities. The abbot, although not entirely exempt from episcopal supervision, derived his authority directly from Rome, and enjoyed a degree of consideration nearly, if not quite, equal to that enjoyed by the bishop himself. Unfortunately, however, after the death of *Charles Martel*, the abuse gradually crept in, of setting over monasteries lay abbots,[1] whose morals ill-accorded with the purity of life required in persons holding their office. These were called *Abbacomites*, in contradistinction to *abbates legitimi.* The Rule generally followed by the monks was that of St. Benedict, which *Columbanus*, *Isidore*, Bishop of Seville, *Fructuosus*, Bishop of Braga, and *St. Boniface* had wisely modified to suit the altered circumstances of people and country.[2]

---

[1] *Capitulare interrogationis* de iis, quae Carolus M. pro communi omnium utilitate interroganda constituit. Capitul. I. et II., a. 811 (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 327 sq.) Conf. *Möhler*, Charlemagne and his Bishops; the Synod of Mentz, A. D. 813. (Tübg. Quart. 1824, p. 367–427.)

[2] After many prior enactments, such as the Capitul. Aquisgr., A. D. 789, c. 71, it is said in Capitul. I., A. D. 805, c. 9: Ut omnes clerici unum de duobus eligant; aut pleniter secundum canonicam aut secundum regularem institutionem vivere debeant. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 296.)

§ 169. *Penance and Discipline.* Cf. §§ 90 and 138.

Theodori archiep. Cantuar. (†690) Poenitentiale, ed. cum notis Jac. Petiti. Parisiis, 1679. (Collectio conciliorum *Labbei*, T. VI.; *Harduin*, T. III.; *Mansi*, T. XII.) *Halitgarius* (†831), de vitiis et virtutib. et ordine poenitentium, libb. V. (Max. Biblioth., T. XIV., together with the Praefatio ad Poenitentiale Roman. *Canisii* Lect. antiq., T. II., Pt. II., p. 81–142.) *Regino Prumiensis*, de Disciplina ecclesiastica veterum, praesertim Germanor., libb. II. (after 899), operâ et studio Joach. *Hildebrandi.* Helmst., 1659, 4to.; ed. *Baluz.* Paris, 1671; ed. *Wasserschleben.* Lps. 1840. †*Kunstmann*, The Latin Penitential Books of the Anglo-Saxons, Mentz, 1844. *Wasserschleben*, The Penitential Ordinances of the Western Church, Halle, 1851, with an excellent Historical Introduction.

The ancient system of *penance*, which exercised so direct and beneficial an influence in elevating and purifying the manners of the Germans, underwent certain modifications on being introduced among them, rendered necessary by the traits of character peculiar to the people.

---

[1] Conf. *du Cange*, Glossar. mediae et infimae latinitatis, s. v. Abbacomites.

[2] The regulae Columbani, etc., in *Holstenius-Brockie*, T. I., p. 166. Conf. *Montalembert*, The Monks of the West, Vols. II. and III.

Heretofore, penitents were permitted to confess their sins more or less frequently, as the piety and devotion of each might prompt; but now, they were commanded, by positive law, to confess uniformly more frequently than formerly. Chrodegang prescribed that canons should confess to their bishops at least twice a year, and laymen oftener. Excellent regulations for administering the sacrament of penance, formed on earlier models,[1] were issued, containing judicious instructions on the mode of treating and directing penitents so that they might derive the greatest amount of profit from their reception of the sacrament. These *penance-books* are of very early origin, some dating back as early as the fifth century, and were first used by the British and Irish, among whom that of *Vinnianus* was the best known. *St. Columbanus* († A. D. 615) composed a penance-book for the Frankish kingdom, to which, during the seventh and eighth centuries, were added some canons of the Frankish councils. It was again enlarged by *Halitgar*, Archbishop of Cambrai and Arras, who added what is known as the *sixth* book.

Of the penance-books composed in England, those of *Theodore*, Archbishop of Canterbury († A. D. 690); of his disciple, Venerable *Bede* († A. D. 735), who had written on the subject before the death of his master; and of *Egbert*, Archbishop of York († A. D. 767), were the best known and most generally used. By the *systematic arrangement* of the materials contained in these works, a new and very valuable penance-book was compiled, the author of which is supposed to have been Venerable Bede. Something on the same plan was accomplished in the Frankish Empire, probably by *Commeanus*, who also made the Anglo-Saxon penance-books the basis of his work. The best printed collection of them is that of *Wasserschleben*.

It was the duty of the *Synodal Courts* to see that the ordinances with regard to confession were carried into effect. The bishop was required to preside once a year over an ecclesiastical court in each parish of his diocese. Seven persons were chosen from among the most trustworthy members of each community, who were called synodal witnesses, or deans (*testes synodales*, *decani*), and constituted a sort of *jury*, an institution which the Germans always had recourse to when a man's character was on trial, and which they wished to see adopted in the ecclesiastical courts, in as far as such form of trial was admissible. The duty of these persons was to watch over the conduct of the parishioners, and to give a report to the bishop, on his arrival, of all those who had, during the past year, transgressed the laws. In the performance of this duty, they were instructed to have no regard of persons, but to denounce the guilty, whoever they might be. Their reports were made the basis of the judgments in every given case, and determined the quality of either the civil or ecclesiastical punishment.[1]

---

[1] See Vol. I., pp. 732, 733.

The *Examination* of *Conscience*, so called, which formed a feature of these ecclesiastical courts, and included in the category of offenses the various degrees and kinds of murder, unnatural lust, sacrilegeous robbery, sorcery, divination, the eating of carcasses, and so on, is important and useful in enabling us to get a correct notion of the morality of the people during this epoch. Public sins were expiated by public penances. Conformably to the discipline which had been in use since the time of *Leo the Great*,[2] those who confessed their sins privately to the priest were privately and at once absolved; but on condition, however, that they should do works of penance and expiation for a *fixed period* of time.

But these penitential exercises were frequently commuted into long prayers, severe fasts, alms deeds, the ransom of captives, and the like.[1] This change, as was natural among a rude and illiterate people, gave rise to a misapprehension of the real nature of penance, against which the Church was constantly obliged to guard. Hence she never relaxed her endeavor to inculcate correct ideas on the nature and effects of the sacrament of penance, and to impress the faithful with a sense of the gravity and severity of the ancient penitential discipline.[2] Whosoever refused to undergo ecclesiastical punishments, together with such as had committed great and flagrant crimes, were excommunicated by the Church and treated with corresponding severity by the State. They were declared incapable of bearing arms, denied the privilege of marrying, and were otherwise restricted in the exercise of their rights. If ecclesiastics, they were deprived of benefices or other positions of emolument, degraded, and cast into prison.

---

[1] Capitul. Carol. M. a. 769, c. 7: Statuimus, ut singulis annis unusquisque Episcopus parochiam suam sollicite circumeat, et populum confirmare et plebes docere et investigare et prohibere paganas observationes, divinosque vel sortilegos, aut auguria, phylacteria, incantationes, vel omnes spurcitias gentilium studeat. Capit. II. a. 813, c. 1: Ut Episcopi circumeant parochias sibi commissas et ibi inquirendi studium habeant de incestu, de parricidiis, fratricidiis, adulteriis, caenodoxiis et aliis malis, quae Deo contraria sunt, quae in sacris scripturis leguntur, quae Christiani devitare debent. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 345.) Description of Synodal Courts in *Harzheim*, T. II., p. 511. *Dove*, The Frankish Synodal-Courts (Journal of Canon Law, years 4 and 5).

[2] See Vol. I., p. 732.

---

[1] Conf. *St. Bonifacii* statuta A. D. 745, can. 31: Quia varia necessitate praepedimur, canonum statuta de reconciliandis poenitentibus pleniter observare: propterea omnino non dimittatur. Curet unusquisque presbyter statim post acceptam confessionem poenitentium, singulos data oratione reconciliari. Morientibus vero sine cunctamine communio et reconciliatio praebeatur. (*Mansi*, T. XII., p. 386, and capitular. lib. VI., c. 206, where, after presbyter, it is added: Jussione Episcopi de occultis tantum, quia de manifestis Episcopo semper convenit judicare. *Baluz.*, T. I., p. 641.)

[2] Particularly important *Conc. Cloveshov.* II. a. 747, can. 26: Vicesimo sexto loco de utilitate eleemosynae Patrum sententiae prolatae sunt.—Postremo igitur (sicuti nova adinventio, juxta placitum scilicet propriae voluntatis suae, nunc plurimis periculosa consuetudo est) non sit eleemosyna porrecta *ad minuendam vel ad mutandam satisfactionem* per jejunium et reliqua expiationis opera, a sacerdote Dei pro suis criminibus jure canonico indictam, *sed magis ad augmentandam emendationem suam, ut eo citius placeter divinae indignationis ira*, quam suis provocavit sibi propriis meritis: et inter haec sciat, quod quanto magis inclita (illicita?) perpetravit, tanto magis a licitis se abstinere debet. (*Mansi*, T. XII., p. 404; *Harduin*, T. III., p. 1958.)—*Conc. Cabillon.* II. (Châlons) a. 813, can. 25: Poenitentiam agere juxta antiquam canonum institutionem in plerisque locis ab usu recessit, et neque reconciliandi antiqui moris ordo servatur: ut a domino imperatore impetretur adjutorium, qualiter si quis publice peccat, publica mulctetur poenitentia, et secundum ordinem canonum pro merito suo excommunicetur et reconcilietur, and can. 34: Neque enim pensanda est poenitentia quantitate temporis, sed ardore mentis et mortificatione corporis. Cor autem contritum et humiliatum Deus non spernit. (*Mansi*, T. XIV., pp. 98, 100; *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1036 sq.) Concerning the change, for instance, of fasting, into other good works, it is said in *Halitgar.*, lib. poenitent.: Sed unusquisque attendat, cui dare debet, sive pro redemptione captivorum, sive super sanctum altare, sive pro pauperibus Christianis erogandum.

Both Church and State were especially vigilant in guarding against a return to the usages of Paganism and superstitious practices, and they pursued such as attempted anything of this nature with the utmost rigor.[1]

The Church of Germany, at this time, had many points of resemblance to the *Old Testament theocracy*; for, in Germany, as formerly in Judea, the union of both Church and State was as absolutely necessary as are moral training and external discipline in any effective system of education for youth.

The mission and purpose of the Church would have been wholly misapprehended had she commenced her work among an untutored and barbarous people by preaching to them of a *religion of the spirit and of the interior freedom enjoyed by the children of God.* Such language could not have been comprehended, and her words would have returned to her void. Such a course would have destroyed her influence at the very outset.

But that the Church did *then*, as *in all ages*, retain a profound consciousness of the supreme and living significance of Christianity, is abundantly proved by the fact that numbers of her children realized, in the purity and holiness of their lives, her highest standard of Christian perfection; and by the further circumstance that many of her canons, enacted at this time, protest, again and again, *that external practices do not constitute the essential elements of true penance*, and that almsgiving is not more effective. The Council of Cloveshove stated, in reply to a wealthy person who applied for absolution from a great sin on the ground that he had given abundant alms, that if divine justice could be so propitiated, it would be in the power of the wealthy to do what Christ alone, and a participation in the work of His redemption, could effect.[2]

---

[1] Capitulare Carlom. Princ. a. 742, c. 5, and Capitul. a. 769, c. 6, conf. Capitul. lib. VI., c. 196, 197, 215; conf. *Phillips*, Germ. Hist. Vol. II., p. 342 sq.

[2] *Conc. Cloveshove*, A. D. 747, can. 26. See above, p. 165, note 2.

CHAPTER IV.

SCIENTIFIC LABORS OF THE GERMANS.

The works of *Du Pin*, *Ceillier*, *Cave*, *Oudinus*, T. I.; see Vol. I., p. 24, note 1. †*Hock*, Gerbert, or Pope Sylvester II., Vienna, 1837, p. 17–22. *Staudenmaier*, Scotus Erigena, Pt. I., p. 295–298. *Alzog's* Patrology, 2d ed., p. 413 sq.

§ 170. *General Character of Science during This Epoch.*

During the period comprised within the present epoch of the Middle Ages, when attempts were being made to adjust and consolidate what had been previously cast into confusion and to draw order from chaos, science, like every other branch of ecclesiastical life, exhibited no marks, either of stability or consistency. It was in a state of preparation; all the elements were indeed at hand, though they had not yet combined; and the result, it was clear, would largely depend on the action of external influences. Later on, we shall see the fathers and schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, like the philosophers of Athens and the prophets of Judea, bearing up under oppression and persecution, conflicts and wars, such as would have terrified and subdued souls less courageous or hearts less dauntless. In the present epoch, as in the earlier day of Alexandria and Rome, mental activity and literary culture were accelerated or retarded by the influence of events which seemed the result of chance rather than the consequence of design.

§ 171. *Progress of Science in Italy, Spain, and the British Isles.*

Bähr, Christian Roman Theology, being a Literary and Historical Review. Carlsruhe, 1837.

In Italy, even amid the shock and convulsions attending the migration of the barbarians, some traces of the former literature of that land were preserved in the writings of the

Scythian *Denys the Little* († before A. D. 536); of *Primasius,*[1] Bishop of Adrumet († c. A. D. 550), who collected the most ancient of the commentaries on the Bible; but particularly in the works of *Boëthius*[2] († A. D. 524) and *Cassiodorus*[3] († c. A. D. 565), both of whom were statesmen and philosophers.

In *Gregory the Great* were revived the nobility of mind and grandeur of character which had distinguished the old Fathers of the Church. The last three contributed, each in his own way, to introduce the treasures of ancient Christian and Pagan classic literature among the Germans.

The first of the Germans who entered upon the field of scientific studies, and excited a noble emulation among their countrymen in the same direction, destined in succeeding years to produce the most important results, were *Ulfilas* († A. D. 383), the historian *Jornandes* (c. A. D. 550), and Gregory of Tours († A. D. 594); while the most distinguished of the Spaniards were *Isidore*, Archbishop of Seville († A. D. 636), who wrote many excellent works, and in his various treatises on eccesiastical subjects,[4] evinced a remarkable degree of originality and independence of thought; and his disciple, *Ildephonse*, Archbishop of Toledo († A. D. 667), who, amid the onerous duties of a long and holy life in the episcopate, managed to find time to devote to deep and scientific studies.

---

[1] *Primasii* episc. Africani, divi Augustini quondam discipuli, in univers. divi Pauli epist. commentarius (max. bibl. T. X., p. 142 sq.; in *Migne*, ser. lat., T. 68.)

[2] Opp. omn. ed. *Rota*, Basil. 1570 f.; in *Migne's* ser. lat., T. 63–64. Commentary on and translation of Aristotle; de duabus naturis et una persona; quod Trinitas sit unus Deus; de consolatione philosophiae, libb. V. ed. *Obbarius*, Jenae, 1843. Against the doubts raised by *Hand* (Cyclopaedia by Ersch and Gruber, s. v. Boëthius) and by *Obbarius*, in his Prolegomena l. c., as to whether the treatise, *de consolatione philosophiae*, could be attributed to the author of the dogmatic treatises just quoted, because Boëthius did not, so it is said, show himself there as a Christian, nor as a Christian philosopher, conf. *Baur*, de Boëthio, christianae doctrinae assertore, Darmstadt, 1841; *Gfrörer*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 948 sq., and *Teipel*, Studies on the Hist. of the Primitive Christian Ages, 2d ed., § 50. According to *Ritter*, Hist. of Christ. Philos., Vol. II., p. 580 sq., and *Nitzsch*, The System of Boëthius and the Theological Writings attributed to him, Berlin, 1860, the decision inclines even more *against* the identity of the author of all these writings. Conf. *Alzog's* Patrology, p. 415.

[3] Opp. omn. ed. *Garetius*, Rothomag. 1679, Ven. 1729, 2 T. f., and in *Migne*, ser. lat., T. 69–70, De artib. ac discipl. liberal. litt.; Institutio ad divin. lection., libb. II.; Hist. eccl. tripartita. Variar. epp., libb. XII.; historia Gothorum in *Alzog*, p. 416.

[4] *Isidori* Hispal. opp. ed. Faust. Arevalus. Rom. 1797, 7 T. 4., in *Migne*, ser. lat., T. 81–84. His principal works are: *Originum seu Etymologiarum, libb. XX.: A summary of the science of his Age, set forth in a cyclopaedical and historical manner (edited separately in Corpus grammaticorum latinorum by *Otto*, T. III). Sententiarum seu de summo bono, libb. III. (the foundation of the later sententi-

The Roman missionaries who came to evangelize the British Isles retained their love of study, and were the first to diffuse a taste for literature among the inhabitants. *Theodore*, Archbishop of Canterbury (A. D. 668–690), a native of *Tarsus*, in Cilicia, and Abbot *Hadrian*, in whom were combined the genius of Roman civilization and the language and culture of Greece, founded many schools in England, from which, in succeeding years, a great number of classical scholars came forth. It was from the monasteries of Ireland and Britain, where knowledge was cultivated and fostered with an ardor and love such as religion alone can impart to intellectual pursuits, that those great moral heroes issued, who, from time to time, crossed over to the continent of Europe to revive an extinct or to preserve a decaying civilization. *Venerable Bede* early brought science in England to a surprising degree of perfection.[1] When seven years of age, he entered the school attached to the monastery of Wearmouth, and, after having passed thirteen years here, under the care of Abbot Benedict Biscop and his successor, Ceolfrid, he was removed to the sister monastery of *Jarrow*, situated, like the former, in Northumbria, where he was admitted to deacon's orders, and, when in his thirtieth year, ordained priest by John of Beverly, then Bishop of Hexham. Sheltered, in this retreat of quiet and holiness, from the storms of barbaric strife that raged with so much violence in the outer world, he earnestly

---

arii). Historia Gothorum, Vandal. et Suevor. in Hispania. Collectio Canon. Concilior. et epp. decretal., afterward, probably wrongly, attributed to him: de scriptoribus eccles.; de ecclesiasticis officiis, lib. II.

[1] *Bedae Venerab.* opp. omn., Paris, 1521, 1544–1554, 3 T. fol.; Basil. 1563; pirated impression, Cologne, 1612 and 1688, ed. *Giles*, London, 1843 sq. 8vo, in *Migne*, T. 90–95.—English versions of his *Ecclesiastical History* were published by Stapleton, in 1565; by Stevens, in 1723; by Hurst, in 1814; by Wilcock, in 1818; and by *Giles*, in 1840. (Tr.) The Vita Bedae Ven. by *Cuthbertus*, placed at the head of his works. Cf. also *Gehle*, De Bedae Venerab. vita et scriptis, Lugd. Batavor. 1838.

applied himself to study, and spent his days in acquiring a knowledge of such literature as was accessible to a student of that age and country. He was well acquainted with Latin and Greek, and partially with Hebrew, medicine, astronomy, and prosody. After having gone through his ordinary exercises of piety, said Mass, recited his divine office, and devoted some time to the study of Holy Scripture, he found his greatest pleasure in adding something to his store of secular knowledge, in teaching and in composing. Among his writings are homilies, lives of saints, hymns, epigrams, treatises on chronology and grammar, and commentaries on the books of the Old and New Testaments. His calm and gentle disposition, the humanizing character of his pursuits, his benevolence and holiness of life, are in striking contrast with the din of battle and the savage fury of the tempest that raged at this time over the fair face of all England. He was truly a light shining out in the midst of darkness. His writings have secured for him the distinction of an unquestionable pre-eminence in the ancient literature of Britain, and the reputation of having been, in all probability, the most learned man of the world in his age.

The death of this great scholar and saint of the Church was of a piece with his preceding life. During the fourteen days previous to this sad event, and while enduring the pain of a malignant disease, he was employed in translating the Gospel of St. John into the Anglo-Saxon tongue, and in teaching youth. Even when his disease grew so violent that he could breathe only with great difficulty, he still continued to teach during the whole day; and, on the very day of his death, dictated to an amanuensis, and urged his scholars to learn quickly, saying: "Make haste and learn; I know not how long I shall be with you, or whether God will not shortly take me to himself." He died May 26, A. D. 735, while singing the words of the doxology, *Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto,* and surrounded by his disciples and the priests of the monastery, to the latter of whom his last words were an earnest entreaty to say the Holy Mass devoutly, and to pray for his soul. He was buried in the monastery of Jarrow, whence his bones were removed, in the middle of the eleventh century, to Durham.[1]

§ 172. *Labors of Charlemagne for the Diffusion of Knowledge.*

Thomassini l. c., Pt. II., lib. I., c. 96–100. *F. Lorentz*, Life of Alcuin, Halle, 1829. *Schulte*, de Caroli M. in literarum studia meritis, Monast. 1826. *Bähr*, de literarum studiis a Carolo M. revocatis ac schola Palatina instaurata, Heidelberg, 1856. By the *same* author: Hist. of Roman Literature in the Carlovingian Age, Carlsruhe, 1840.

Although *St. Boniface* has the honor of having been the first to awaken a desire and cultivate a taste for scientific studies in the inhabitants of the Frankish Empire, still the rapid and general diffusion of knowledge was especially due to the generous encouragement and intelligent efforts of Charlemagne. He gathered about him, in his own court, a *second band* of *distinguished scholars*, who, unlike those in England, and formerly in France, were neither Romans nor Greeks, but for the most part Germans. Charlemagne had acquired a taste for letters and intellectual pursuits during his stay in Italy, but being now at an advanced age, and having passed his life in the profession of arms, he realized with pain that the hand which had wielded the sword with so much vigor was but ill adapted to the exercises of the pen. But, while unable himself to make any considerable progress in learning, he zealously stimulated the desire in others, and seized every opportunity to promote its advancement. He induced *Peter* of *Pisa*, and *Paulinus*, Patriarch of Aquileia († A. D. 804), to leave Italy and take up their residence at his court. At the request of Desiderius, King of the Lombards, *Paul Warnefried*,[2] or Paulus Diaconus, of the abbey of Monte Cassino, became his master of *Greek*, won his confidence, and, with only temporary interruptions, retained his friendship until his own death, which occurred A. D. 799. But, of all those learned men whom Charlemagne had attracted to his court, none possessed nearly so much influence over his mind as the English monk *Alcuin*, formerly the head master of the school of York, and incomparably the greatest scholar of his age. Prudently availing himself of the influence which, as friend and counselor, he possessed with the Emperor, he reorganized the *Schola Palatina*, established in the vicinity of the imperial palace, for the education of the youth of the higher ranks, upon a new basis, and established others at all the cathedrals and cloisters of the empire, in which a complete curriculum of studies, embracing the so-called *seven liberal arts*, was adopted. This consisted of the *Trivium*, comprehending grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric, and the *Quadrivium*, comprehending arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. The disquisitions of *Martianus Capella* and *Cassiodorus*, based upon models left by the educators who had preceded them, exercised no inconsiderable influence upon the organization of schools of learning.[1] Toward the close of his life, Alcuin wished to withdraw from the bustle of court and the distraction of temporal concerns to prepare, in quiet, for his departure from this world. But, though the Emperor acceded to his request in so far as to release him from immediate and laborious service, he still wished him to aid, by his advice, the work to which so many days of his life had been consecrated. The abbotship of the monastery of St. Martin, at Tours, having become vacant, in the year 796, it was conferred upon Alcuin, who, however, shortly after, conscious of the approach of death, and desiring to be free from all care, resigned it in favor of one of his disciples. He had often expressed a wish, during the last years of his life, to die on the feast of Pentecost, which God, whom he had so faithfully served, was graciously pleased to grant. He departed this life May 19, A. D. 804.

---

[1] See *Chambers'* Cyclopaedia, art. Beda or Bede.—Bishop *Ullathorne*, of Birmingham, stoutly maintains that the bones of Venerable Bede are still resting at *Durham;* while the Benedictine monks of Subiaco no less stoutly maintain that his relics were, after the Reformation, first brought to Gibraltar, and were subsequently transferred to *Subiaco*, where they are actually venerated. (Tr.)

Alcuin, after he had become abbot of St. Martin's, established a school at Tours,[1] whence issued such men as *Amalarius* of Treves; *Rabanus* of Mentz; *Hetto*, Abbot of Fulda; *Haimon*, Bishop of Halberstadt, and *Samuel* of Worms.

---

[1] A *resumé*, containing substantially everything of importance relating to the *seven liberal arts*, is to be found in *Terentius Varro*, Cicero's friend; more definitely in *St. Augustine*, viz., in his works de ordine et doctrina christiana, and likewise in the fantastic treatise of another African, *Martianus Capella*, de nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, de septem artibus liberalibus, libb. IX., ed. *Kopp*, Frcf. 1836; ed. *Eissenhardt*, Lips. 1866.

Besides the schools already mentioned, there were many others in a flourishing condition at this period, or shortly after. Such were those of Orleans, Toulouse, Lyons, Rheims, Corbie, *Aniane*, Saint-Germain-d'Auxerre, *Saint-Gall*, *Reichenau*, Hirsau, *Fulda*, Utrecht, Mentz, *New-Corbie* (Corvey on the Aller), Treves, and others.

In these retreats of learning, where the reason was severely exercised, the intellectual faculties trained to quick apprehension and subtle distinction, and the heart fed and warmed by the writings attributed to *Denys the Areopagite*, which were now coming into general favor, might be discerned—faintly, indeed, but unmistakably—the elements which produced that long race of laborious *Schoolmen* and *Mystics* who became so prominent during the Middle Ages.

A tolerably correct idea of the degree of excellence reached in scientific studies and literature, in this epoch, may be had from the various treatises, writings, and *ecclesiastical hymns* that have come down to us from the scholars and poets of that age.[2]

There can be no doubt that the primary motive which stimulated Charlemagne to found and protect schools was the formation of a learned and efficient body of clergy. This, however, need excite no surprise, as religion was then the center of all that constituted intellectual and spiritual life. But the education of the people was by no means neglected, as is proved by the case of *Theodulph*, Bishop of Or-

---

[1] *Alcuini* opp. ed. Frobenius, Ratisb. 1776 sq., 2 T. f., in *Migne's* ser. lat., T. 99–101. They contain 232 important letters, lives of saints, poems, treatises, and extend over almost all branches of human knowledge.

[2] We remind the reader but of the following: Prayer to God, "Rex Deus immensi quo constat," by *Eugenius* of Toledo († 637); "Crudelis Herodes, Deum regem venire quid times," and "Ad regias Agni dapes," by *Sedulius* (Sheil, an Irishman.—Tr.); of the Holy Innocents, "Hymnum canentes martyrum," by Beda the Venerable; Hymn on St. John B., "Ut queant laxis resonare fibris," by *Paulus* Diaconus; to God, "Te homo laudet," by *Alcuin;* "Veni creator spiritus," *pretendedly* by Charlemagne; the anthem for Palm Sunday, "Gloria, laus et honor," by *Theodulph* of Orleans.

leans († A. D. 821), a zealous co-laborer of Charlemagne in the cause of learning, who founded *primary schools*[1] in his diocese for the benefit of his flock, and it was not long before many followed his example.[2]

§ 173. *First Heresies—Adelbert and Clement—Adoptionism.*

I. *Elipandi* epp. ad Fidelem abbatem; ad Carolum M. (in *Florez*, España Sagrada, T. V., an. 1751 and again 1859); ad Alcuinum; ad Felicem (nuper conversum). *Beati* et *Etherii* de adoptione Filii Dei advers. Elipand., libb. II. (*Canisii* lectt. antiq., T. II., Pt. I., p. 279 sq., and *Galland.* bibl., T. XIII., p. 290 sq. *Migne*, ser. lat., T. 96.) *Alcuini* libell. advers. haeres. Felicis; ep. ad Felicem; advers. Felic., lib. VII.; advers. Elipand., lib. IV. (opp. ed. *Froben.*, T. II.) *Paulini Aquilejensis* sacrosyllabus et cont. Felic., libb. III. (opp. ed. *Madrisius.* Venet. 1787 fol.) *Agobardi* archiep. Lugdun. advers. dogma Felic. (opp. ed. *Baluzius*, Paris. 1666.) in *bibl. max.* Lugd. T. XIII. et XIV.; in *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 99–101. Letters and Documents in *Mansi*, T. XIII. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 863 sq. German in *Rösler's* Library of the Fathers of the Church, Pt. X., p. 569–590. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. III., p. 601–654. *Werner*, Hist. of Apolog. and Polem. Literat., Vol. II., p. 433 sq.

II. *Madrisii* dissert. de Felicis et Elipandi haeresi, in his ed. opp. Paulini. *Fr. Walch*, Hist. Adoptianor., Götting. 1755. *Frobenii* dissert. de haeres. Elip. et Felic. (opp. *Alcuini*, T. I.) Relatio historica de ortu et progressu haeresium, praesertim vero Augusto-Vindelicor., Ingolst. 1654. *Walch*, Hist. of Heretics, Pt. IX., p. 667 sq. Against him, *Enhueber*, dissertat. dogmat. hist. quae contra *Christ. Walchium* adoptionis in Christo homine assertores, Felicem et Elip. merito ab Alcuino Nestorianismi fuisse petitos ostenditur (in *Alcuini* opp., T. I., etc.; in *Migne*, T. 101, p. 337–438). *Seiters*, Boniface, p. 418 sq. *Helfferich*, Visigothic Arianism, Hist. of Spanish Heretics, Berlin, 1860, p. 86–151.

About the year 744, when St. Boniface was in the very midst of his labors and the full tide of success, he encountered a most formidable opponent in a Frank by the name of *Adelbert.*

---

[1] His indefatigable activity is most conspicuous in his capitulare ad parochiae suae sacerdotes, A. D. 797, in *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 913 sq. *Mansi*, T. XIII., p. 995 sq.

[2] A circular of Charlemagne, addressed to all the bishops and abbots in 788, recommends the erection of these schools, "constitutio de scholis per singula Episcopia et monasteria instituendis." Capitul. Aquisgr. a. 789, c. 70: Non solum servilis conditionis infantes, sed etiam ingenuorum filios adgregent (canonici et monachi) sibique socient. Et ut scholae legentium puerorum fiant, Psalmos, notas, cantus, computum, grammaticam per singula monasteria vel episcopia discant. Sed et libros catholicos bene emendatos habeant, quia saepe dum bene aliquid Deum rogare cupiunt, per inemendatos libros male rogant. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 173.)

This enthusiast assembled the people for divine worship in the field and in the open air, and imposed upon their credulity by pretending to have received relics from the hands of an angel, and distributed among them copies of a letter which, as he said, had fallen from heaven and alighted in the center of the city of Jerusalem. With empty vanity he compared himself to the apostles, whose equal he pretended to be; caused houses of prayer to be dedicated to his honor, because, as he claimed, God would infallibly grant a request made in his name; and asserted that, as he knew by intuitive vision the secrets of every man's conscience, confession was wholly useless. *Confession* was therefore abolished by him, veneration of saints reprobated, and pilgrimages to holy shrines discontinued.

Boniface made use of every available means to counteract the influence of this visionary. He preached against him, drew the attention of the first Council of Soissons (A. D. 744), and of a council held at Rome in the succeeding year, to his doctrines, and finally caused his imprisonment at Fulda. Having escaped from this place of confinement, he was seized by shepherds, robbed, and murdered.

Clement, an Irish bishop, whose case had occupied the attention of the last-named council, was also among the adversaries of Boniface. He assailed some of the teachings and practices of the Church with great vigor and pretentious display, but with little, if any, real ability. He objected to the Judaico-theocratic constitution of the Church, denied that the canons of councils and the writings of the Fathers are a safe rule of faith, and, drifting still further from the true spirit of Catholic teaching, held erroneous opinions on some fundamental doctrines of the Church, such as *predestination.* He also held that, when Christ descended into the regions of the dead, He set free all those who had been confined in hell, whether believers, infidels, or idolaters. He advocated and practiced lax principles of morality, rejected *celibacy*, and continued to exercise episcopal functions,[1] though living with a concubine, by whom he had two sons. He was condemned to a life of confinement, by order of the Synod of Rome (A. D. 745).

---

[1] *Bonifacii* ep. ad Zachariam, in *Serarius*, 135 (Max. Bibl., T. XIII., p. 126 sq.), in *Würdtwein*, ep. 67. Conf. *Harduin*, T. III., p. 1935 sq. *Mansi.* T. XII., p.

These were but trifling errors, when compared with the magnitude of *Adoptionism*, and the vital consequences it involved. This heresy was little more than a revival of the old Greek controversies on the nature of Christ, but particularly of Nestorianism, according to which the Hypostatic Union[1] was denied, and so wide a distinction drawn between the divine and human natures in Christ, as to amount to a separation of them into two persons. The heresy of Nestorius grew out of an attempt to give a rational explanation of the doctrine of two natures in one person, and to make it clearly intelligible to the understanding.[2] The distinctive doctrine of the adoptionists was that Jesus Christ, inasmuch as He was man, was the Son of God by *adoption.*

If the accounts that have come down to us may be trusted, the first traces of this heresy in the West were to be found in Spain, where it gave evidence of its presence as early as the sixth century. *Isidore of Seville* (†A. D. 636) states that Justinian, Bishop of Valencia (A. D. 535), wrote against some who had adopted the ancient error of the Bonosians,[3] asserting that Christ was not the Son of God in any proper sense (proprium), but *by adoption.* The error spread with great rapid-

---

373 sq. *Natal. Alex.* h. e. saec. VIII., c. II., art. 2. *Walch*, Hist. of Heret., Pt. X., p. 3-65.

[1] See Vol. I., p. 594.

[2] Although Adoptionism was, in a certain sense, a revival of Nestorianism, it should not be regarded as embracing precisely the same doctrines as the latter. The following are the chief points of difference between the two: 1. The Adoptionists did not object to the term Θεοτόκος as applied to the Blessed Virgin, while the denial of such application of this term was the very basis of the Nestorian heresy. 2. The Adoptionists admitted, and the Nestorians denied, that there was but one Person in Christ. But the former, while admitting this, explained their meaning, by saying that the two Persons were so closely allied as to practically amount to but one Person, though there was no absorption of the human personality into the divine. 3. The Adoptionists taught that Christ assumed humanity, while the Nestorians, inverting this order, said that Christ had exalted Himself by his virtue. (Tr.) Cf. *Blunt's* Dict. of Heresies, art. Adoptionists.

[3] See Vol. I., p. 761.

ity, and the eleventh Council of Toledo (A. D. 675), taking up the question, declared: "This Son of God is His Son by nature, not by adoption"—"Hic etiam filius Dei *natura*, non adoptione." Notwithstanding the vigorous measures taken to repress and extinguish it, the error again reappeared two centuries later, when the Church of Spain was languishing under the oppressive yoke of the Saracens. Some historians have *conjectured* that this fresh attempt to revive an old error by endeavoring to satisfactorily explain the mystery of two Natures and one Person in Christ by the lights of reason, was prompted by a desire to render the doctrine of the Incarnation less offensive to the Mahommedans of Spain. Be this as it may, certain it is that the theory was received with universal applause, and found numerous advocates. Among its foremost champions were *Elipandus*, Archbishop of Toledo, a man of advanced age, but haughty and passionate; and *Felix*, Bishop of Urgel, who, though still young, was more moderate, more prudent, and more learned than the former, and, possessing a naturally acute intellect, was a skillful dialectician. They both flourished toward the close of the eighth century. Elipandus was the first to develop the doctrine. He was refuting one *Migetius*, who, in treating of the Trinity, had explained it, in a Sabellian sense, to mean a triple manifestation of the Godhead: first, as the *Father* in the person of David; second, as the *Son* in the person of Christ, and, third, as the *Holy Ghost* in the person of St. Paul.[1] Migetius made a further distinction between the Word (*λόγος*) and the Son of God (*υἱὸς ϑεοῦ*), maintaining that the Word became the Son of God only in the Incarnation; that He became a *Person* only when He became man; that the humanity of Christ was a condition of His personality in the same sense that St. Paul was a condition of the personality of the Holy Ghost. Elipandus, in replying to him, declared that the Word had been truly and properly the Son of God prior to the time when Christ became man, but that Christ as *man* was called the Son of God only in an allegorical or improper sense.

---

[1] *Hefele*, Hist. of the Migatians, Tübg. Quart. 1858, p. 86–96.

Felix, on the other hand, being desirous, while combating Mohammedanism, to reconcile, in as far as possible, its teachings with those of Christianity, went too far, and fell into the *Nestorian* heresy, which partially expressed Mohammed's idea of Christ as a prophet of God. Entertaining this view himself, Felix at once approved the theory of Archbishop Elipandus, who had submitted it to his judgment (A. D. 783). Having thus compared and harmonized their views, both came forward, openly and boldly proclaiming the doctrine "that, as to His *divinity*, Christ was by nature and truly the Son of God (filius Dei natura seu genere); but that, as *man*, He was the Son of God in name and by *adoption* (voluntate, beneplacito, gratia, susceptione); that, as to His divinity, He was truly God, but that, as to His humanity, He was not, but only called so by metonymy, or figure of speech, as men are sometimes called the children of God. It is evident, therefore, that the two prelates advocated the Nestorian theory of a complete separation of the two natures in Christ, denied the hypostatic union, and, as a consequence, repudiated the mystery of the Incarnation.

In defense of their teaching, they appealed to the writings of some of the old Fathers of the Latin Church, such as Hilary, Marius Mercator, and particularly to *Isidore of Seville.* They also cited some passages from the *Mozarabic Liturgy*,[1] in which they maintained the term *adoptio* was used. It was indeed true that such expressions as Christ "*adopted manhood*" and "*adopted flesh*" were to be found in the passages quoted, but in the active sense, meaning that Christ took upon Him our manhood and assumed our flesh, and not in the passive sense, as if the meaning were, Christ was adopted as Son. Christus sibi adoptavit carnem seu hominem; not, as the Adoptionists said, Christus secundum hominem a Patre adoptatus est.

---

[1] *Isidor. Hispal.* "(Christus) Unigenitus autem vocatur secundum divinitatis excellentiam, quia sine fratribus; primogenitus secundum susceptionem hominis, in qua per adoptionem gratiae fratres habere dignatus est, de quibus esset primogenitus." Etymologg. VII. 2. Of the Mozarabic Liturgy, these passages were urged: "Qui per *adoptivi hominis passionem*, dum suo non indulsit corpori, nostro demum—pepercit.—In missa de ascens. Domini: "Hodie Salvator noster per *adoptionem carnis* sedem repetit Deitatis."—In missa defunctorum: "Quos fecisti adoptionis participes, jubeas haereditatis tuae esse consortes." Conf. Liturgia Mozarab. ed. *Alex. Lesle.* Rom. 1755. 4.

In defending his theory, Felix drew his arguments chiefly from those which had been furnished by Nestorius. He spoke of the Word (λόγος) as dwelling in the humanity of Christ as in a temple; said that Christ was a man bearing a Divinity within Him; that He resembled other men in all things except sin; that he was adopted into Sonship by God in the same sense as men loved of God become His children; that the difference between the two cases was one of degree, and not of kind; that this solemn act of adoption took place *at the moment of baptism* in the Jordan, when God the Father uttered these words: "*This is my beloved Son;*" and that, as man may be both a natural and an adopted son, so also was Christ by nature the son of *David*, and by grace or adoption the Son of *God*.

As Elipandus availed himself of the influence which he possessed as archbishop to spread his errors, while he at the same time branded the teaching of the Church as heresy, there was a twofold reason for taking energetic measures to oppose him and refute his doctrine. The first to undertake this task were *Beatus* of Libana, abbot of the monastery of Valliscava, and *Etherius*, Bishop of Osma, both Asturians, who, in the year 785, wrote exhaustive treatises in refutation of the heresy. They began by appealing to the *authoritative* decisions of the Church concerning the Hypostatic Union of the two Natures in Christ, and then went on to show that Christ, as man, was also truly the Son of God, and that the Adoptionists, in separating the two natures, had made two Christs instead of one—a thing which necessitated a Quadrinity, instead of a Trinity, in the Deity.

Pope Hadrian I., hearing of the dangerous nature of the heresy, wrote (A. D. 785?) a letter to the orthodox bishops of Spain, in which he warns them against the "blasphemy" of Elipandus, "which," he goes on to say, "no previous heretics have dared to enounce, except Nestorius, who confessed the Son of God to be mere man."

Felix, who, as Bishop of Urgel, a city belonging to the Frankish kingdom, was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan see of Narbonne, was commanded by Charlemagne to appear at the *Council of Ratisbon* (A. D. 792), to explain and defend his doctrine. Felix abjured and anathematized his errors before the council, but, being still suspected, he was sent to Rome, under charge of a certain Angilbertus, where he made frequent recantations, both in writing and by word of mouth, of his former errors, and finally swore, before the Blessed Sacrament on St. Peter's tomb, to give them up forever. Pope Adrian, satisfied with this solemn asseveration of his orthodoxy, permitted him to return to his diocese, where, coming into contact with his former friends, who were still Adoptionists, he again fell into his old errors and denounced his adversaries.

Alcuin, who had, in the meantime, returned from England and taken up his residence at the Frankish court, wrote, at the request of Charlemagne, a formal refutation of Adoptionism (Liber adv. haeresin Felicis). In the hope of inducing Felix to give up his error, he sent to that prelate a copy of his refutation, accompanied with a letter filled with such expressions of good-will and kindness as might best soothe the pride and win the affection of a wounded and humiliated spirit. This measure having failed, Charlemagne summoned a *council* to convene at *Frankfort* (A. D. 794), to consider the question. It was very numerously attended, there being present, besides the papal legates, three hundred bishops from Germany, Gaul, Aquitaine, Britain, and Italy; but neither Felix nor any one of his party appeared. The fathers took up the question relative to the veneration to be paid to pictures and images, but that which chiefly occupied their attention was the heresy of the Adoptionists, which they again condemned, and reasserted the orthodox doctrine in these words: "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God; not an adopted and strange son, but a true and proper" (non adoptivus sed verus; non alienus sed proprius). Pope Hadrian called a *synod at Rome*, in the same year, in which the decree of Frankfort was confirmed.

After these condemnations, Felix wrote a defense of his doctrine in detail, to which Alcuin replied in a work (Adv. Felicem, libb. vii.), which justly holds the first place among his writings. At the request of Alcuin, Charlemagne sent this work to Pope Adrian, and the Frankish prelates, *Paulinus*, Patriarch of Aquileia, *Richbod*, Archbishop of Treves, and *Theodulph*, Bishop of Orleans, accompanied with a request that they would also take part in the controversy, in defense of the orthodox faith, and against the errors of Felix. The most important of all the writings which this request called forth was the treatise of the Patriarch of Aquileia, who, pursuing a line of argumentation similar to that adopted by St. Cyril[1] against Nestorius, proved, as Alcuin had already done, that the heresy of the Adoptionists was but a *revival* of *Nestorianism.*

But even these efforts, though energetic and well directed, were far from subduing the pride and overcoming the obstinacy of Felix and Elipandus.

Measures were, however, at once taken to check the progress of their errors and prevent them from spreading further among the faithful. Charlemagne sent *Leidrad*, Archbishop of Lyons; *Nefrid*, Archbishop of Narbonne, and the abbot *Benedict* of Aniane, to Urgel, and their labors were so completely successful that they succeeded in bringing twenty thousand souls, including clergy and laity, back to the bosom of the Church, and prevailed upon Felix to again submit his cause to the judgment of a council held at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, A. D. 799. Here Felix sustained a six-days controversy with Alcuin, after which he again acknowledged and retracted his error, but was not allowed to return and take charge of his diocese.

In the year 800, the same missionaries were sent a second time, by Charlemagne, into the districts infected with the heresy, and, by their labors and preaching, brought ten thousand more of those who had gone astray into the Church.

---

[1] *Alcuin.* contra Felic., lib. I., c. 11: Sicut Nestoriana impietas in duas Christus divisit personas propter duas naturas;—ita et vestra indoctra temeritas in duos eum dividit filios, unum proprium, alterum *adoptivum.* Si vero Christus est proprius filius Dei Patris et adoptivus: ergo est alter et alter. And in another place: Hoc velim certissime vos cognoscere, o viri fratres hujus adoptionis in Christo assertores, quod quidquid beatus *Cyrillus*, Alexandr. eccles. pontifex, synodali auctoritate impio respondit Nestorio, vobis responsurum esse absque dubio sciatis; quia ejusdem erroris impietas ejusdem veritatis responsionibus destrui debet.

Elipandus alone held out. Living in that part of Spain occupied by the Saracens, he was beyond the reach of either the authority of Charlemagne or the efforts of Alcuin. He therefore retained possession of his see till his death, which occurred A. D. 810. The errors of the Adoptionists perished with their chief representatives. Like every other evil that has afflicted the Church, this also effected a measure of good. The Frankish bishops were brought face to face with a strictly dogmatical subject, with which they were forced to deal in its purely speculative aspects, and this necessitated a deep and extensive study of ancient dogmatical literature. The writings of *Alcuin* amply prove that this study embraced wide scope, and was conscientious and thorough.

§ 174. *Charlemagne.*

I. Codex Carolinus (cont. annales, capitularia, and epp.) **Jaffé*, Monumenta Carolina (Bibl. rer. Germ., T. IV.) *Einhardi* (Charles' Secretary, †844) vita Caroli; *Monachus Sangallensis*, de gestis C. M.; *Poëto Saxo*, Annal. de gest. Carol. (*Pertz*, T. I. and II.)

II. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Vol. 25, especially p. 455–486. *Phillips*, Vol. II., p. 32–87 and 359 sq. *Einhard*, Life of Charlemagne, Introd. Original text, Explanations, and Documents, by *Ideler*, Hamburg, 1839, 2 vols. **Sporschil*, Charlemagne, his Empire and House, Brunswick, 1846; Charlemagne's character is given briefly and masterly, in *Giesebrecht's* Hist. of Emperors, 2d ed., p. 121–143. *Alb. Thijm*, Charlemagne and his Age, revised German ed., Münster, 1868.

That *Charlemagne* played a very important part in the external organization of the Church, and particularly within the limits of the Frankish Empire, can not be questioned. He had conceived the design of establishing a Germanic or Frankish Empire on the model of that of ancient Rome, whose underlying principles of legislation and government should be, not national merely, but *Christian* also. He had caught the idea of founding such an empire as this from that incomparable work of St. Augustine, the City of God, which constituted his favorite reading. This religious tendency was always uppermost in the mind of Charlemagne. It is conspicuous in the magnificent *discourse* which he delivered at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the month of March, A. D. 802; it is the one pervading idea which characterized all his *Capitularies*, notably that of the year 789[1], and introduced a new element into the legislation of his empire. In examining the wonderful and complex structure of this empire, one is struck at every turn with its decidedly religious character. The conviction was strong upon the mind of Charlemagne, that without religion, legis-

---

[1] The *Capitulary* is given in *Pertz's* Monumenta, T. III., p. 53 sq., and in *Walter's* Fontes Juris Eccl., p. 46–75. It says, among other things: "Let peace and harmony and concord reign throughout Christendom, among bishops and abbots, counts and judges, among men of all conditions and in all places; for without peace, it is impossible to please God." This *Admonitio domni Caroli imperatoris* reads: Audite fratres dilectissimi, pro salute vestra huc missi sumus, ut admoneamus vos, quomodo secundum Deum juste et bene vivatis et secundum hoc saeculum cum justitia et cum misericordia convertamini. Admoneo vos inprimis, ut credamus in unum Deum, omnipotentem Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum. Hic est unus Deus et verus, perfecta Trinitas et vera Unitas, Deus creator omnium visibilium et invisibilium, in quo est salus nostra, et auctor omnium bonorum nostrorum. Credite Filium Dei pro salute mundi hominem factum. — — Credite unam ecclesiam, i. e. congregationem bonorum hominum per totum orbem terrae; et scitote quia isti soli salvi esse poterunt et illi soli ad regnum Dei pertinent, qui in istius ecclesiae fide et communione et caritate perseverent usque in finem; qui vero pro peccatis suis excommunicantur ab ista ecclesia et non convertuntur ad eam per poenitentiam, non possunt ab saeculo aliquid Deo acceptabile facere. — — Haec est ergo fides nostra, per quam salvi eritis, si eam firmiter tenetis et bonis operibus adimpletis, quia fides sine operibus mortua est et opera sine fide etiamsi bona Deo placere non possunt.

Primum ergo *diligite Deum* omnipotentem ex toto corde et ex omnibus viribus vestris. — — *Diligite proximos vestros* sicut vos ipsos et eleemosynas facite pauperibus secundum vires vestras. Peregrinos suscipite in domos vestras, infirmos visitate, in eos, qui in carceribus sunt, misericordiam praebete. — — Dimittite vobis invicem delicta vestra, sicut vultis, quod vobis Deus dimittat peccata vestra. Redimite captivos, adjuvate injuste oppressos, defendite viduas et orphanos; juste judicate, in iniqua non consentite, iram longam non teneatis, ebrietates et commessationes superfluas fugite. — — Reconciliate citius ac pacem inter vos, quia humanum est peccare, angelicum emendare, diabolicum est perseverare in peccato. Ecclesiam Dei defendite et causam ejus adjuvate, ut possint orare sacerdotes Dei. Quod Deo promisistis in baptismo recordamini; abrenunciastis diabolo et operibus ejus. — —

Unusquisque in eo ordine Deo serviat fideliter, in quo ille est. *Mulieres* sint subjectae viris suis in omni bonitate et pudicitia, custodiant se a fornicatione et veneficiis et avaritiis, quoniam qui haec faciunt, Deo repugnant. Nutriant filios suos in Dei timore et faciant eleemosynas ex tantum quantum habent hilarem mentem et bonam voluntatem. *Viri* diligant uxores suas et inhonesta verba non dicant eis; gubernent domos suas; in bonitate conveniant ad ecclesiam frequentius. Reddant hominibus, quae debent sine murmuratione et Deo, quae

lation would be destitute of any adequate sanction, and possessed of neither authority nor true influence. This is also plain from the fact that the Emperor, while engaged in carrying on war in distant countries, never relaxed his energy in establishing religious houses at home; and from the further fact, that he took great pleasure in listening to the homilies of the Fathers of the Church,[1] which he had read while taking his meals; and manifested a lively interest in discussions on theological questions, as in the controversy relative to *Adoptionism* and *Images*. "Would to God," he was wont to say, "that I possessed twelve men such as *St. Augustine*." To which Alcuin would promptly reply: "The Creator of heaven and earth was content with one."

The enlightened love entertained by Charlemagne for scientific studies; the zeal displayed by him in attracting to his court learned men from every nation, and in establishing

---

Dei sunt cum bona voluntate. *Filii* diligant parentes suos et honorent illos. Non sint illis inobedientes, caveant se a furtis et homicidiis et fornicationibus; quando ad legitimam aetatem veniunt, legitimam ducant uxorem, nisi forte illis plus placeat in Dei servitium intrare. *Clerici canonici* episcoporum suorum diligenter obediant mandatis; gyri non sint de loco ad locum. Negotiis saecularibus se non implicent. In castitate permaneant, lectioni sanctarum scripturarum frequenter amore Dei intendant, ecclesiastica diligenter exerceant. *Monachi*, quod Deo promiserunt, custodiant, nihil extra abbatis sui praeceptum faciant, turpe lucrum non faciant. Regulam memoriter teneant et firmiter custodiant, scientes praeceptum, quod multis melius votum non vovere, quam post votum non reddere. *Duces, comites* et *judices* justitiam faciant populis, misericordiam in pauperes, pro pecunia non mutent aequitatem, per odia non damnent innocentes. Illa apostolica semper in corde teneantur, quae ajunt: *Omnes nos stare oportet ante tribunal Christi*, ut recipiat unusquisque prout gessit, sive bonum, sive malum. Quod Dominus ipse ait: *In quo judicio judicabitis, judicabitur de vobis*, i. e. misericorditer agite, ut misericordiam recipiatis a Deo. *Nihil occultum, quod non sciatur, neque opertum, quod non reveletur; et pro omni otioso verbo reddimus rationem in die judicii.* Quanto magis faciamus omnes cum adjutorio, ut cum Deo placere possimus in omnibus operibus nostris et post hanc vitam praesentem gaudere mereamus cum Sanctis Dei in aeternum.

Brevis est ista vita et incertum est tempus mortis; quid aliud agendum est, nisi ut semper parati simus? Cogitemus, quam terribile est incidere in manum Dei. Cum confessione et poenitentia et eleemosynis misericors est Dominus et clemens; si viderit nos ex toto corde ad se convertere, statim miserebitur nostri. — — (*Pertz*, T. III., p. 101–103.) The very incorrect wording and construction have been corrected.

[1] Inter coenandum, says *Eginhard*, delectabatur et libris St. Augustini, praecipue his, qui *de civitate Dei* praetitulati sunt.

schools and institutions of learning as a means of civilizing his subjects; and his solicitude that whatever he did should be based upon thoroughly *religious principles*, prove that he was intellectually far in advance of his age, and not unworthy of the high mission to which he was called. The esteem in which Charlemagne held everything connected with religion, and the recognition of its necessity in the functions of government, will afford a sufficient explanation of his reverence for the Head of the Church, and of the enthusiasm with which the subjects of his vast empire hailed the news of his coronation as *Emperor of the Romans*, and of the alacrity they manifested in yielding obedience to his authority. But, while recognizing the necessity of a close intercourse between Church and State, and of their need of each other's support, and while careful not to encroach upon the rights of the former,[1] he was by no means blind to the importance of *rigorously defining* the *respective limits of the authority of both.*[2]

An ecclesiastical sanction had already added fresh luster to the imperial dignity; but in order to still further strengthen the authority and consolidate the power of the State, the Emperor appointed *imperial commissioners* or *deputies* (missi dominici), whose office and functions have been described above. The court consisting of these commissioners also protected the personal liberty of the subjects, so frequently hazarded in the Frankish Empire by the concentration in the hands of one person of both the judicial and executive authority.

While the dukes and counts still retained and exercised the executive authority and power, the legislative branch was given into the hands of the Court of Imperial Commissions (missio dominica), consisting of persons selected by the Emperor himself, and distinguished by intellectual strength, superior cultivation, tact, and perseverance in investigating facts, skill and judicial temper in deciding upon their merits and bearing, and by all those qualifications which specially fit men to be dispensers of justice. "The good and gracious Emperor, solicitous for the welfare of the poor, the widows, and the orphans of his Empire,[1] desired to provide for them and for the entire people, without cost or trouble, a tribunal at which they might at all times obtain the justice which had hitherto been denied them."

---

[1] See p. 160.

[2] Conf. capitul. I. Interrogandi sunt, in quibus rebus vel locis ecclesiastici laicis aut laici ecclesiasticis ministerium suum impediant. In hoc loco discutiendum est atque interveniendum, in quantum se episcopus aut abbas rebus saecularibus debeat inserere, vel in quantum comes vel alter laicus in ecclesiastica negotia. Hic interrogandum est acutissime, quid sit quod Apostolus ait: Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis saecularibus (2 Tim. ii. 4) vel ad quos sermo iste pertineat. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 328.) Cf. †*Dr. Braun*, Carolo M. regnante quae inter ecclesiam et imperium ratio intercesserit, Friburgi, 1863.

The inaugural address delivered by Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 802, breathes the same religious spirit as pervades that delivered at the diet held in the same city in the year 813, when he bestowed the crown and other emblems of royalty upon his son, Louis the Mild, "with," as he expressed it, "Christ's consent." And, pitching his voice in a higher key, he exhorted the prince before all things to love and honor God; to keep His commandments; to protect the Church; to love her bishops as his own children; to show kindness to the princes of his own blood; to regard his subjects with the same parental feeling that he would his own offspring; to provide for the poor; to raise to office and positions of trust only such as were distinguished by integrity and holiness of life; to chastise offenders with a view to draw them from their evil ways and insure their eternal welfare; and to be the protector of the religious and the comforter of the poor. The prince, upon being asked by his venerable father if he were prepared to comply with these injunctions, answered that, "with the help of God's grace," he would.

The untiring energy displayed by Charlemagne, and felt in every corner of his wide empire, laid the foundation of all that is noble and beautiful and useful in the history of the Middle Ages. For centuries after he had passed away, his memory was cherished by a loving and grateful people, who pointed with pride to their magnificent institutions as the heritage of the illustrious founder of the Germanic Empire.[1] But, amid all this greatness and glory, the mind of Charlemagne was not exempt from sad forebodings of the future. Evidences of the coming storm were already above the horizon of Europe. Standing upon the battlements of one of the strongholds on the shores of the North Sea, and gazing away into the distance, where the sails of the piratical vessels of the Northmen were disappearing from view, his features assumed an expression of sadness and his eyes filled with tears. Upon being asked the cause of this unusual depression, he replied: "Alas! if these men are so audaciously aggressive in my own lifetime, what will not my people have to suffer when I am no more!"

---

[1] Such are the dispositions of the emperor at the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 802. (*Harzheim*, T. I., p. 365.) Conf. "Charlemagne's laws and legislation for widows and orphans, the poor and travelers" (Hist. Polit. Papers, by *Phillips* and *Görres*, Vol. I., p. 406–413.

It were well for the memory of Charlemagne if there were fewer blemishes upon his domestic life. Then, too, would the prayer which this brave warrior was accustomed to pour forth from the fullness of his heart, in the silence of the night, have ascended purer and pleaded with more efficacy at Throne of Grace. But, notwithstanding these ineffaceable spots upon his character, *Pascal* the Antipope, during the time of Alexander III., acting on the suggestion of Frederic Barbarossa, placed him on the calendar of the saints. Though succeeding pontiffs neglected to cancel his name, his many derelictions of conjugal fidelity and the scandal which necessarily attached to him because of his having had three natural sons, viz., Drogo, Theoderic, and Hugh, called from many persons the most emphatic protests against such action. Hence his name has never been entered upon either the Roman or the Benedictine calendar, notwithstanding that the Benedictine order was the especial object of his favor and bounty.[2] All, however, have concurred in conferring upon him the title of "*Great;*" nor would it be possible to deny it to him, when we take into account all the institutions which he called into existence for the promotion of science, art, and good government, and compared the condition of the Frankish Empire, at the time of his accession, with the prosperity and glory which it reached at the close of his life.

---

[1] Conf. *Cantù*, Universal History, German by *Brühl*, Vol. V., Preface, p. lxiv.

[2] The Congr. of Rites lately, under *Pius IX.*, limited the celebration of his Anniversary to the city of Aix-la-Chapelle. The Officium de St. Carolo in *Canisius-Basnage* lectt. antiq., T. III., Pt. II., p. 205 sq. Conf. *Walch*, Historia canonisationis Caroli M., Jenae, 1750. *Möser*, Hist. of Osnabrück, Pt. I., p. 320.

He died January 28, A. D. 814, in the imperial palace at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the seventy-second year of his age and forty-sixth of his reign, and was buried in the cathedral which he had himself built.

Seated upon a throne of gold, with head erect, bearing a sword at his side, his loins girt about with the cord of a pilgrim, and holding in his hand the Book of Gospels, Charlemagne seems still, in death, the presiding genius of his people and the inspirer of those great conceptions which he realized in his own life.

Paulus Diaconus, the son of *Warnefried*, inspired by motives of love and gratitude, said truly of him: "One knows not which to admire more in this great man—his bravery in war or his wisdom in peace, the glory of his military achievements or the splendor of his triumphs in the liberal arts."

CHAPTER V.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 175. *General View.*

Conf. *Fred. von Schlegel,* Philosophy of Hist., Vol. II., pp. 69–91.

The Church had barely succeeded in arresting the tide of barbaric invasion by creating and organizing the Holy Roman Germanic Empire, when she was again threatened by the warlike fanaticism of Islamism. The violence and persecuting spirit of the ancient Romans seemed again revived, not now, as then, sustained and directed by prudent counsels and the dictates of cool reason, which distinguished every measure of that kingly people, but roused into action and fanned into a glowing flame by the wild excesses of an overheated Oriental imagination. The powers of Darkness, which had been brought under control by Christianity, again broke forth fresh against the Church, and checked the progress of her pacific pursuits.

Islamism, instead of drawing a sharp line of distinction between the external polity of the Church and that of the State, and uniting the two internally by strong and intimate bonds, adopted a less intelligent, if more summary, mode of proceeding, by forcing the two into a sort of mechanical union. Mohammed totally ignored the traditionary and historical union which Christianity had effected between Church and State, and, in the recklessness of blind rage and ignorant stupidity, snapped this connecting link between the ancient world of Paganism and the degenerated world of Christianity. The new commandment which he gave to the world was *vengeance;* the new purpose of life, the indulgence of the carnal appetites; and pride the new motive of action. His teaching inculcated the most brutal despotism, and what he advocated in theory he carried out in practice.

Was it possible that the *invasion of these Arabs*, a people so widely different in origin and character from the Germans, and professing a religion so antagonistic to Christianity, could have the effect of restoring fresh life, youthful vigor, and full manhood to the people of the ancient world? Islamism might, indeed, in virtue of some elements of good which it possessed, have curbed the wild excesses of these rude and savage hordes, and imparted to them a certain degree of civilization, but it could have done no more. The enervating sensuality which was its essential element and characteristic, would inevitably have bred future troubles and sown the seeds of moral decay.

If there was ever a time in the history of the Church when she should have been prompt in decision, energetic in action, and prepared to turn to practical account all her strength and power, it was now, when she was brought face to face in deadly conflict with the blind fury of Islamism. These qualities have ever been characteristic of the Church in her supreme hour, nor was she wanting in them now. But, though this be said of the Church as identical with Christianity, it is far from true as relates to the Eastern Church, which, at the time of which we are speaking, was totally destitute of these qualities, torn with distraction and *rent into numerous sects*. Weakened and exhausted by internal disorders, she gradually fell a victim to *vain speculations*, idle questions, petty disputes, futile and refined theories. It was not long before all religious life, in any true sense, almost entirely died out amid this seeming intellectual activity. If anything more was necessary to wholly extinguish it, this soon came in the shape of *religious tyranny* and imperial dogmatism and assumption. The emperors, by arbitrarily nominating to episcopal sees men whose chief title to merit was their readiness to comply with the imperial pleasure, excluded others who would have made worthy and enlightened pastors. This policy of excluding men of character and ability from the highest and most responsible offices in the Church, and admitting others who possessed neither, opened a wide door to the enemy of the Christian name. Accordingly, the Eastern Church, thus enfeebled and rapidly going to decay, though she still bore upon her the tokens of life, was incapable of opposing either moral authority or material strength to the encroachments of Mohammedanism, then in the full vigor of youth, drunk with the blood of conquest, and ready to enforce its claims with great and victorious armies.

§ 176. *Mohammed—His Doctrine—Its Rapid Progress.*

Alcorani textus universus, arabice et latine, ed. *Marracius.* Patav. 1698 fol., Lips. 1834. German by *Boysen*, Halle, 1773; by *Wahl*, Halle, 1828; by *Ullmann*, Crefeld, 1841.—*Abulfeda* (saec. XIV.), annales Muslemici, arabice et latine, ed. *Reiske.* Havn. 1786 sq., 5 T. 4to.; *ejusdem*, historia anteislamica, arab. et lat., ed. *Fleischer*, Lps. 1831; the vita Mohammedis, arab. et lat., ed. *Gagnier.*, Oxon. 1723, fol. TR. ADDS.:—Eds. of the Koran, by *Flügel*, 1834, and *Redslob*, 1837. Engl. transl. by *Sale*, 1734; *J. M. Rodwell*, London, 1861. French transl. by *Kasimirski*, Paris, 1840.

Gagnier, la vie de Mahom., Amst. 1732, 2 T. **Döllinger*, The Muhammedan Religion, Its Interior Development and Influence on the lives of Nations, Ratisb. 1838. *Weil*, Muhammed the Prophet, his Life and his Doctrine, Stuttg. 1843. By the *same*, Hist. of the Ismaelian Nations, given in a Synopsis, 1866. *Sprenger*, The Life and Doctrine of Muhammed, Berlin, 1861 sq., 3 vols. *Kremer*, Hist of the leading Ideas of Islamism, Lps. 1868. **Nöldeke*, "*Muhammed*" in *Herzog's* Encyclopaedia, Vol. XVIII., p. 767 sq.

At the opening of the seventh century, no country of the world presented more striking features and extraordinary contrasts than Arabia, whether in regard to its soil, its climate, or the civilization of its inhabitants.

The *Ichthyophagi*, or Fish-eaters, who dwelt upon the shores of the Persian Gulf, were, of all the classes composing its motley population, the most ignorant and degraded; next, but a degree higher, came the *Beduins*, who, possessing a warm imagination and lively temperament, led a pleasant and happy life, tending their flocks in the interior of the country; finally, the *inhabitants of the cities*, who formed a third class, were highly cultivated, of agreeable manners and pleasing address.

Owing to the geographical isolation of Arabia, it afforded an easy and secure retreat to such as were threatened with persecution in Asia; and thither, from the earliest times, men holding every shade of opinion and professing every sort of religious belief had sought and found an asylum, and now composed the heterogeneous mass of its inhabitants.

But this people, so various in origin, so seemingly antagonistic in religious profession, and so widely separated, both by education and calling, possessed in common one central place of worship, viz., the *Kaaba*, or Holy House *of Mecca*. Within this sanctuary was a great shapeless black stone of the highest antiquity, to which divine honors were paid. A tradition existed, according to which this stone had been first placed there by Abraham, and was intended to symbolize the *One* God; and that, having been once displaced, it was again restored by the Amalekites. By and by it came to be surrounded with numerous idols, said to be three hundred and sixty in number; and to the Holy House, sanctified in their minds by the presence of so many gods, the Arabs went annually, in great troops, on pilgrimages. Sabeism was indeed the most prominent feature of this superstitious and idolatrous worship; but, notwithstanding the absurdity and grotesqueness of the various forms which religious belief assumed throughout all Arabia, the primitive idea of *one God and one religion* was never entirely lost sight of.[1] The large communities of Jews settled in every part of the peninsula, and a considerable number of Christians of the humbler and illiterate class preserved it where it had not been lost, and revived it where it had.

It was such influences as these that induced *Mohammed* (from *hammada*, meaning "one to be praised," or the "desired," his real name being *Abul Kasem Ibn Abdallah*) to reject the worship of idols and return to the primitive religion of monotheism. But the sensual element so characteristic of his race was predominant in Mohammed's new system, was always a prolific source of trouble, and eventually effected its ruin.

Mohammed, who was the only son of Abdallah, a *Pagan*, and Amina, a *Jewess*, and was descended from the noble but impoverished family of *Hashim*, of the *priestly tribe* of *Kore-*

---

[1] The prayer addressed by the ancient Arabs to *Allah Taala*, the Most High God, ran as follows: Cultui tuo me dedo, o Deus, cultui tuo me dedo. Non est tibi socius, nisi socius, quem tu possides, et una, quidquid ille possidet. Even the known symbolum, "There is no God but the one God," was in use among the Arabians when Mohammed rose up as its herald. See *Döllinger*, Ch. H., p. 250; v. *Maltzan*, Pilgrimage to Mecca.

ish, who were the chiefs and keepers of the national sanctuary of the Kaaba, and pretended to trace their origin to *Ismaël*, the son of Abraham and Hagar, was born at Mecca, August 20, A. D. 570. His father died two months before his birth, and his mother when he was six years of age. He then passed under the care of his grandfather, who died two years later, when his uncle, Abu-Talib, who, though poor and having a large family, took charge of him and treated him with much kindness. While a boy, he earned his living as a shepherd; but little is known, with certainty, of his early life. Grave in his exterior deportment, of imposing address and agreeable manners, he was entirely destitute of the early training and literary accomplishments so necessary to soften the natural asperities of his character and check the impetuosity of his temper. According to his own admission, *he could neither read nor write.*

Though naturally inclined to a contemplative life, he was forced, in consequence of his poverty, to have recourse to commerce for a livelihood. In the course of his commercial travels, he spent some time in a Nestorian monastery at Bozrah—a circumstance which, while increasing his love of contemplation, failed to produce upon his mind a favorable impression of Christianity.[1] When, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, he married a wealthy Meccan widow, Khadijah by name, then in her thirty-eighth year, who had intrusted to him the care of her Syrian trade and was pleased with his capacity for business, and perhaps still more with his handsome person and courtly address.

Mohammed had, from his earliest years, manifested a decided *inclination* for *solitude*, and it was his custom to put aside mercantile affairs and withdraw to a cave in a mountain near Mecca, where he would shut himself up, for a month together, every year. When in the fortieth year of his age (A. D. 610), he pretended to have had *visions*. He said that, while sleeping in a cave in Mount Hira, the Angel Gabriel appeared to him, and, calling him thrice, bade him "cry." This was his first revelation, after which he fancied himself possessed of devils, and would have put an end to his life had he not received a second revelation, in which he was bidden to "arise and preach." These pretended *visions* were continued till the end of his life. He at first communicated them only to Khadijah, his wife; Ali, his cousin; Zeid, his freedman and adopted son; Abu-Bekr, his attached friend and prudent counselor; Othman, who, as well as Abu-Bekr, afterward became Caliph, and a few others. After having passed a long retreat in the cave of Mount Hira, he appeared as a public teacher, in the year 611, declaring that "*there is but one God, and Mohammed is His prophet.*" Having been, in early life, subject to epileptic fits, he at first regarded these visions as the work of evil spirits; but, having been reassured by the repetition of them, and encouraged by his friends, he finally brought himself to believe, or to affect to believe, that they were divine messages, communicated to him through the agency of the archangel Gabriel. In the pretended revelations which took place at a later period of his life, it is not difficult to discover that he was at times both deceiving himself and consciously deceiving others.

---

[1] According to the account of *Paulus Diaconus*, *Zonaras* (twelfth century), and other historians.

It is not at all improbable, that, from the very beginning of his career, he entertained the vain hope that the Jews would eventually recognize him as the long looked-for *Messiah*, and the Christian sects of Arabia as the promised *Paraclete*. But when the youthful Ali, his cousin, speaking in his defense, declared that he would break the teeth, pluck out the eyes, rip open the bodies, and cut off the legs of such as would dare oppose the Prophet of God, the people of Mohammed's own tribe of Koreish rose up in indignation against him, and threatened to take his life. Rejected and persecuted by the Koreishites, he fled from Mecca, July 15, A. D. 622, and, after a three-day's journey, reached the city of Hatshreb, or Yathrib, afterward called Medina, an abbreviation for *Medinat-al-Nabi*, or the City of the Prophet. This event is called the Hegira (*Hedshra*), or Flight, and marks an epoch in the life of Mohammed. Henceforth, Islam and its founder will take their place in the history of the world.

He was received by the inhabitants of Medina with every demonstration of respect, and was conducted into the city in triumph. He had, up to this time, led a comparatively obscure life, but he was now to come forth as the prophet and founder of a new political and religious system, destined to make a hitherto insignificant people play a most important part in the history of the world. He at once commenced a war against the Koreishites, which, at first, consisted of predatory attacks upon caravans, but soon assumed the dimensions and acquired the importance of a great and organized struggle. After many successes and some reverses, he finally marched on Mecca (A. D. 630), and encountered but slight opposition before getting possession of the place. The Prophet, entering the city, went directly to the Kaaba, and saying, "Truth is come, let lies depart," ordered all the idols to be broken before his eyes. Having thus purified the national sanctuary, hallowed by the presence and memory of Abraham and Ismaël, of all abominations, he made it the chief temple of the new worship.

The religious belief[1] of Mohammed, which he professed to

---

[1] The *Korân* and the *Sonna* are the authoritative sources of Doctrine.

The Korân consists of the revelations which Mohammed professed to receive from time to time, either directly from God or through the Angel Gabriel. The name *Korân* (lit. "that which is read," or "that which ought to be read,") is applied both to the whole work and to any part of it. It has many other titles with the Mohammedans: Al Forkan, "Liberation," "Deliverance," hence "Illumination," "Revelation;" Al Moshaf, "The Volume;" Al Kitab, "The Book;" Al Dhikr, "The Admonition." It is divided in 114 chapters ("Suras," "rows, primarily of bricks in a wall," thence "a line" of writing). Each chapter is divided into verses (Ayat, "signs," "wonders"), which vary slightly in different editions. Both suras and verses are of very different lengths, the suras having from three to two hundred and eighty-six verses, the verses being from one to nearly twenty lines. Each sura has its title, taken either from some subject treated or some person mentioned in it, or from some important word, often in the middle or near the end of the sura. Some suras have two titles; some verses have also titles of their own. Next to the title comes the mention of the place where, according to tradition, the sura was revealed—Mecca, Medina, or partly at Mecca, partly at Medina. To every sura but the ninth is prefixed the form of blessing, "In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful." This blessing is called "Bismillah," from the first word in the Arabic. It is used at the beginning of all books and public documents, before meals and other actions, and is constantly on the lips of Mohammedans. . . .

The Koran is composed absolutely without any arrangement or system what-have received from time to time, either directly from God or through the Angel Gabriel, and which, after his death, had been collected from the palm-leaves, bits of leather, stones, mutton-bones, and other materials on which the several revelations had been written, and arranged into one book, known as the *Korân*,[1] is little more than an incongruous mixture of *Parseeism*, *Judaism*, and *Christianity*.

Mohammed's knowledge of the two last does not appear to have been derived from the Old and New Testaments, but rather from *apocryphal Jewish* and *Christian* legends.[2] It was

---

soever. It has neither beginning, middle, nor end; it is a gathering of irregular scraps, indiscriminately put together. . . .

Three stages may be recognized in the composition of the Koran: 1. The period of early struggles, marked by a higher poetical spirit, an appreciation of the beauties of nature, more intense feeling and earnestness. 2. The period of controversy and the formation of doctrine, showing a more prosaic and didactic style, with frequent repetitions of histories and legends. 3. Period of power, of legislation, moral and ecclesiastical, indicated by a more dogmatic and commanding tone, and comparative freedom from histories and legends.

The Sonna (lit. "custom"). The second authoritative source of doctrine is an amplification and explanation of the Koran. It consists of the sayings and doings of the Prophet, as handed down by tradition, put into writing, at the earliest, at the end of the first century after the Hegira. The original purpose of the collectors of traditions was to supply materials for the decision of questions of doctrine, morals, law, and even of habits and customs when the Koran is silent. The Sonna, therefore, chiefly deals with matters of practice. . . .

The traditions are all cast in the same form. They are seldom more than ten lines long. Each relates usually only to one fact, in the same style, and in the form of a dialogue. At the head of each is put the chain of witnesses (Isnad), on whose authority the tradition rests, beginning with the writer, and going up to some companion of the Prophet. This is of great importance, and is, with the Mohammedans, a test of the "soundness" of a tradition. They are on all possible subjects. (*Blunt's* Sects and Heresies, art. Mohammedans.—Tr.)

[1] The *Koran* is composed of 114 *Suras* (capita), each of which opens with the words, written in cyphers: "Be smilahi rachmâni rachîmi, i. e. In the name of the All-merciful, of the All-bountiful." Every Sura (tradition) is again divided into Ayats, or verses. As to the subject-matter, the doctrine of the Koran, or the *Islam* (from salama, to be safe; fourth conjug., to devote one's self to God), is divided into the *Iman* (doctrine of *faith*) and *Din* (justice, or moral doctrine). Of the expounders of the Koran, the orthodox party are called *Sunnites* (traditionalists); the heterodox are called *Shiites*. Conf. *Weil*, Hist. Crit. Intr. to the Koran, Bielefeld, 1844. (Tr.)

[2] *Möhler*, On the relation in which, according to the Koran, Christ stands to Muhammed, and the Gospel to the Islam (*complete works*, Vol. I., p. 348–402); *Geiger*, What has Muhammed plagiarized from Judaism, Bonn, 1833. †*Maier*,

said, even by the contemporaries of Mohammed, that Abdallah Ebn Salam, a *Jew*; Salam, a convert from Parseeism to Christianity, and Sergius, a Nestorian monk, had aided him in compiling his religious system. Such were the heterogeneous constituents of *Islam* (Submission to God)—a simple, but incomplete system, the one essential element of which is hatred and execration of every other religion.

The followers of Islam and descendants of Abraham, like their forefather, adored but *one* God, and in this they were equally opposed to both the Polytheism of the Pagans and the Trinitarian dogma of the Christians. Their faith as regards God was embodied in the motto of the Koran: "la illah ill 'Allah"—i. e. "*there is no God beside God.*" As God has no Son, there can be no Incarnation, and, as the name indicates,[1] Mohammed is His promised Paraclete. *Abraham*, *Moyses*, and *Christ* were sent by God to announce an imperfect and partial Divine revelation, the completion and perfection (chocma) of which was reserved to Mohammed. The chief of the attributes ascribed to God, and insisted upon with special emphasis as those most frequently called into exercise, are *omnipotence*, *omniscience*, and, above all, *mercy*. Hence, every public document commenced with the words, "*In the name of the All-merciful.*"

Angels, created before man, and consisting of an ethereal fire or light, hover about the throne of God, and never weary of serving and praising Him. The four most important angels are *Gabriel*, the angel of revelation, declared to be identical with the Holy Ghost; *Michael*, the protector of youth and friend of the Jews; *Azrael*, the angel of death; and *Izrafil*, who shall sound the trumpet on the day of judgment. The Koran speaks also of an angel guardian, and of another, once called Azazil, but who, refusing to comply with God's command and worship Adam at his creation, was cursed for his pride, fell from his high estate, and became *Eblis*, or Satan.

Christian Elements of the Koran (Freibg. Journal of Theology, Vol. II., p. 34–97). Conf. *Grosse*, Essay of a Christology of the Koran, Gotha, 1840.

[1] This pretension is without foundation, because "*Mohammed*," though synonymous with *περικλυτός*, far-famed, is not with *παράκλητος*.

He has no power over believers, but is constantly engaged in seducing others.

God created *man* out of dust to be His representative on earth. Some He made white, some black, and others of a color resulting from a mixture of the two. His soul is part of the Divine Being, and his body God commanded to be circumcised, like that of *Ismaël*, the patriarch of the Arabs, in the thirteenth year after birth. He is subject by *irreversible decree* to a Divine and irrevocable law, according to which his actions and his destiny are *foreordained and predetermined.*

Islam repudiates redemption, justification, grace and its influence as a means of salvation. But in all that regards eschatology, or the end of man and his condition after death, it is especially full, depicting in glowing words and endless variety of expression the grossly sensual pleasures of *Paradise*, and giving, by way of contrast, a frightful account of the tortures of *Hell.* On the Last Day, the *bodies* shall *rise* from their resting-place, and all men go to judgment. After judgment, all men will pass over the bridge Al-Sirat, which extends over the midst of hell, is finer than a hair, sharper than a sword's edge, and beset on both sides by briars and thorns. The good will pass, with Mohammed and the prophets, in safety into paradise; the wicked will fall into hell, where they will endure tortures of fire and other punishments. Their bodies will be ever fresh for the flame; for their flesh, though constantly consumed, will be constantly renewed.

Paradise is a place flowing with milk and honey, and abounding in every delight for the enjoyment of the good. They will feast on the most delicious meats, and drink water which never becomes impure; each shall enjoy the society of his own wives and of the charming and incontaminable black-eyed houries, or girls of paradise.

The Koran is filled with protests against the Christian dogmas of the *Divinity of Christ* and the *Trinity*, and against the *veneration* of *images*. Speaking of the divinity of Christ, Mohammed says: "There is no cause for marvel if, in the promulgation of such a doctrine, the heavens opened, the earth was rent, and the mountains fell in." "If," said he, "you affirm that God has a Son, you must also admit that He has a wife." Mohammed arrived at this conclusion in the following way: The Arabs believed all angels to be *females*, and Mohammed held that the angel Gabriel, being the supreme angel, was identical with the Holy Ghost. He therefore concluded that the Christians had raised this angel to the dignity of wife of God, and that he was consequently a female Divinity. This being once established, there was no difficulty in allowing that a third Divinity, or *Jesus*, was the fruit of this union. And in matter of fact, there is an *apocryphal* writing, in which *Jesus* is represented as addressing the *Holy Ghost* as *His mother.*

With regard to *morality*, the Koran may be said to concern itself only about external practices, paying little, if any, attention to the purity of *interior motives*, or to the *conditions of true sanctification.* The principal branches of practice are three—*prayer*, *fasting*, and *alms-giving.*

I. *Prayer.* In praying, the worshiper turns toward Mecca, where the Kaaba is situated, this being the direction which leads along the way to God. Prayer is ordered to be made *five times daily:* 1. Before sunrise; 2. Just after noon, when the sun begins to decline; 3. Midway between noon and nightfall; 4. A little after sunset; and 5. When the evening has just set in. The times of prayer are proclaimed by Muezzins from the minarets of the mosque, in a sort of chant. This religious service consists of inclinations, frequent ejaculations of the form, "God is great," and prayers and recitations taken from the Koran. Public worship takes place in the mosque every Friday at noon. This day is called "the day of assembly," and the service is the same as that of private devotions, with the addition of a sermon. Women are not admitted into the mosque, or allowed to attend public service, except on festivals.

II. *Fasting* is a means of gaining heaven, and is both obligatory and optional. The obligatory fast takes place yearly, during the month of Ramadhan, because the Koran was given in that month. It commences with the new moon and continues to the next new moon. The Moslem is bidden to fast every day, from the time it is light enough to distinguish between a black and white thread until sunset, from eating and drinking, from smoking and perfume, and from all sensual indulgence. Of the optional fasts, the most important is that of the Ashura, the tenth day of Moharram, or the first month. It was instituted and made obligatory by Mohammed, shortly after the Hegira, when he was trying to win over the Jews, but was afterward left to the option of each believer.

III. *Alms-giving* was at first prescribed, but afterward made voluntary, and is regarded as effectual in opening the gates of Heaven to the worshiper. In the early days of Moslemism, the alms were collected by officers appointed by the sovereign, and were applied to pious uses. Their payment was afterward left to the conscience, and their application determined by the wish, of the giver. Both men and women were each expected to make at least one *pilgrimage to Mecca* and Mt. Arafat in the course of their lives. Each one may either go himself or send another, whose expenses he pays.[1] But the most meritorious of all actions, according to the Prophet, was to *co-operate* with the saints in efforts *to propagate the new religion by force of arms*. Female chastity consisted in loyal fidelity to husbands and in shunning whatever might tend to excite their jealousy. In men, on the other hand, it consisted in having no illicit intercourse with strange women or female slaves other than those of one's own household. Besides as many female slaves as one might choose to possess, he was also allowed to have *four wives*. One who had not a sufficiently ample fortune to marry free women was advised to content himself with slaves. In its relations to woman, Islam is in every sense far inferior to Paganism. On the other hand, the use of wine and all spirituous liquors was forbidden.

---

[1] This pilgrimage takes place in the month of Dzul-hajji. The ceremonies to be performed by the pilgrims are very numerous and complicated; the chief of them are the wearing of the *Ihram*, or sacred garment, consisting of two simple pieces of cloth wrapped round the loins and over the shoulder; going three times round the Kaaba or Holy House of Mecca, kissing or touching each time the black stone, said to have fallen from heaven; making a journey to Mount Arafat, about ten miles distant from Mecca, and offering victims, either goats, sheep, kine, or camels. *Blunt's* Sects and Heresies, art. Mahometanism. (TR.)

A religious system such as this, so congenial to the temperament and national character of the Arabs, and whose fundamental principles may be comprised under these two heads, viz: 1. *As to faith and the intellectual domain, exclusive and prescribed unity;* and, 2. *As to practice, unbounded and unlimited enjoyment,* would naturally have a greater hold over, and exercise a deeper influence upon, the children of the desert than the exalted teaching and moral requirements of Christianity.

Still, the terrible doctrine representing God as absolutely preordaining man, and man as irrevocably predestined, to an eternity of either happiness or misery, early met with a most decided opposition. Those who refused to accept its more harsh and repulsive features formed themselves into one of the *numerous sects*[1] into which this religious system, apparently so simple, was eventually split, and professed the doctrine in a modified form.

The Moslem *form of government is an absolute despotism,*[2] and seems an essential element of the system; though, judging from the examples of Hindoo kings and Chinese emperors, there would not appear to be any necessary connection between it and the genius of the Asiatic people. It is therefore peculiar to Moslemism—a peculiarity which may be sufficiently accounted for by bearing in mind that in the Moslem system there is a thorough amalgamation and complete identification of the spiritual with the temporal power, and that the latter is, moreover, simply a military domination, based upon the right of conquest. This being the case, there will be no difficulty in understanding the drift of Mohammed's political axiom: "*Two religions can not co-exist in the same State.*"

---

[1] *Döllinger's* work, entitled "The Religion of Mohammed," may be consulted for an account of the Moslem sects, pp. 79–134.

Between the sects of the *Kadris* and *Dshabaris* and the orthodox believers of Islam, there was an opposition somewhat analogous to that which the *Predestinarians* and *Pelagians* manifested toward orthodox Christianity. Neither are the hopeful anticipations of the *Mehdi,* in their relations to Islam, unlike the wild *chiliastic* reveries of the Christian Millenarians. There were also some mystic sects among the Moslems, the chief of which was that of the *Sufis,* who somewhat resembled the *Pantheists* and *Quietists.* L. c., p. 105 sq.

[2] Conf. *Döllinger,* l. c., p. 38 sq.

Islam is little more than a bald and superficial imitation of Judaism, without, however, its *expiatory and vicarious sacrifices*. Neither does the Koran make any mention of a hierarchy or teaching body of religious men. Mohammed and his successors themselves officiated as prayer-leaders, and exhorted the believers. Still, though it was soon found necessary to appoint certain persons with specific religious duties, these do not bear the most remote resemblance, either in character or office, to anything in the Christian hierarchy. None of them are regarded in the light of ordained priests—neither the *Shciks*, who preached; nor the *Khatibs*, who read the Koran; nor the *Imans*, who presided at the daily prayers; nor the *Muezzins*, who proclaimed the times of prayer from the minarets; nor the *Kayim*, who had the custody of the mosques. The functions of all these may be discharged equally well, and just as lawfully, by any ordinary Moslem. Even the *Ulemâs*, a college of men composed of three orders, of which that of the Muftis, or *Doctors of Law* and Theology, is the highest and most respected, resemble the Christian clergy only in external appearance, holding about the same relation to them as the Moslem *dervishes* to the Christian monks. As a natural result and logical consequence of such a ministry, the *worship* of Islam is barren and empty, and an enemy to all symbolism and pictorial representation. Nor are the two chief but meaningless festivals of Islam, called *Ids*, and by the Turks *Beirams*—the greater intended to commemorate the sacrifice offered by Abraham, and the lesser the termination of the fast of Ramadhan; nor *Friday*, the sacred day of Islam—intended to commemorate the creation of the world, and consequently a day, not of rest, but of labor and general activity—at all calculated to give the Moslems a correct idea of divine things, or to inspire them with high and holy thoughts, and lift their hearts heavenward, like the solemn fasts of Christianity, which have naturally, and as if by a law of necessity, grown out of the great facts connected with the redemption of mankind.

Mohammedanism spread rapidly. Its progress was partly due to the personal qualities and efforts of Mohammed himself, who, being affable in his address and simple in his manners, liberal and beneficent, daring and sensual, and, when occasion required, harsh and cruel, propagated the religion of Islam sword in hand; combating, with terrible energy and indomitable resolution, whoever dared to resist his command, and holding out to such as espoused and took up arms in defense of his cause eternal happiness and perpetual and ever-renewing delights amid the cooling and refreshing shades of Paradise; but partly, also, to the discords of the Christians, which prevented them from combining and successfully resisting the new enemy, and to the sympathy of the Nestorians and Monophysites of Syria and Egypt, who were discontented with Byzantine rule. The latter were for a time favored by the ambitious and fanatical Moslem, who encouraged them to secretly aid and abet the war which they themselves were openly to undertake against the Lower Empire. So rapid were their conquests, that on the death of Mohammed, who was attacked by tertian fever and carried off, June 8, A. D. 632, nearly the whole of Arabia had been subjected to the faith of Islam; and, during the course of the first century after the Hegira, these lately converted and fanatical Arabs went forth under the leadership of the immediate successors to Mohammed, the Caliphs (Khalif, "Successor"), *Abu-Bekr*, and *Omar I.*, and, before the close of the year 639, had subdued all Syria and Palestine. After the deplorable capitulation of Jerusalem (A. D. 637), *Sophronius*, the Patriarch of the city, conducted Omar into the Church of the Resurrection, crying out, as he passed through the bewildered people who had gathered there: "Behold the abomination of desolation in the Holy Place, foretold by Daniel the Prophet." *Egypt* was subdued by Othman in A. D. 640, and *Persia* in A. D. 651. The Church of the East, split up into rival sects and weakened by internal dissensions, was incapable of unity, either of purpose or action, and entirely destitute of the vigor and courage characteristic of the ages of faith, which opposed arms to arms, repelled force by force, and gloried in defending the Cross of Christ.

During the caliphate of the Ommiads, *the entire coast of Northern Africa* (A. D. 707), with its once flourishing churches, and even *Spain* itself (A. D. 711), were subdued by the Saracens. Constantinople alone still held out, after having successfully sustained two long and obstinate sieges (A. D. 669–676, 717–718).

There can be do doubt that *Islam, with its terrible genius for destruction and its hundred millions of believers, has,* like all the great events which take place *in this world by the inscrutable decrees of Providence,* a determinate influence and *special office* in the moral government of mankind. It is not, however, permitted us to fathom the depths of the Divine Councils, or to do more than venture, with becoming reverence, a vague guess and doubtful forecast as to the ultimate purpose of the Supreme Disposer of all things. As Mohammed commenced by combating Paganism, it is not unlikely that the *monotheism of the Moslems* was intended to be for those idolaters who embraced it, one of the stages in their passage to Christianity. And, judging from the rigorous character of the then prevailing *rationalism,* it should seem that it would be a very efficient means of leading such Mohammedans, and even Jews, as had acquired any considerable degree of mental and moral culture, to the knowledge and acceptance of Christianity. When it is borne in mind that idolatry was prevalent in Africa, and pantheism in Asia, the propagation of the faith of Islam, and the consequent authority which it exercised over men's minds, may be regarded as constituting a sort of breakwater, or *spiritual quarantine,* protecting the already *degenerate Christianity*[1] of the *Eastern* nations from any further mutilation and perversion that might come from those quarters.

Were proof needed that the danger of a wide-spread and complete corruption was really approaching and imminent, it might be furnished, not only in the tendency then so decided and prevalent among the Christians of the East, to split into innumerable heretical and discordant sects, but also in the fact that the immoral, corrupting, and extravagant doctrine of the Paulicians and Bogomiles was received with universal favor. Nay, more, the schismatical Greeks had become so degraded that even the Mohammedans, when referring to them as compared with themselves, were accustomed to speak of them in terms of contempt.

---

[1] *Döllinger,* The Religion of Mohammed, p. 140 sq.

When Islam is considered in its relations to *Western Christendom*, its mission is still more apparent. The Moslems, being in a sense the representatives and inheritors of the Old Law, became instruments in the hands of God for the chastisement of the *enfranchised and free nations of the West, thus at once checking their downward course and punishing their degeneracy*, rousing them from their inactivity, and calling into life their slumbering energies. When chastisement had been administered, their work was accomplished; the scourge was arrested, and the spirit of wrath and vengeance disappeared. The Church had indeed been violently shaken by the terrible convulsions by which South and Southwestern Europe was visited; but, when these had passed away, the world beheld the old edifice, though somewhat damaged by the mighty tempest that had swept over her, still as firmly seated as ever upon her immovable foundations, and rising in more than her ancient strength and beauty from the surrounding ruins.

Notwithstanding the vast power and wide dominion exercised by the Moslems, they have for centuries been disquieted by a prophecy,[1] according to which "*the Ottoman Empire is one day to be destroyed by the Christians.*"

While considering these events from our point of view, we should not forget the pecular position of Christians under the domination of Mohammed and the Caliphs. While declaring Christ to be a mere man, Mohammed professed the greatest respect for both Him and His Gospel. He at times treated the Christians with remarkable lenity; thus acting a part strangely inconsistent with his own professed revelations. Even the Caliphs were at first tolerant of the Christians, probably from political motives, imposing no heavier burden than a *capitation tax* on either them or the Jews. Moreover, many educated Christians wrote *apologies*, in which they defended their own faith, demonstrated the inadmissibility of the interpretations put upon certain texts of the Old Testament by which they were made applicable to Islam,[1] maintained the divinity of Christ and the free will of man, refuted with unassailable arguments the doctrine of fatalism and of unconditional predestination, and the assertion that God is the author of evil.

---

[1] *Ludov. Domenichi* makes mention of these prophesies in his Profetie dei Maometani, Firenze, 1548.

But the Caliphs soon put an end to such inconsiderate controversy. Elated by their success and numerous victories, they carried into practical effect the political axiom of Mohammed which had hitherto been held in abeyance: "Two religions can not co-exist in the same State." They replied with the sword to the arguments of Christian apologists, treated the Christians themselves as an obnoxious sect, and gave them the alternative of apostasy or death.

§ 177. *The Controversies of the Iconoclasts in the East and in the Frankish Empire.*

A.—BYZANTINE ICONOCLASTS.

I. *Mansi*, T. XII–XIV. *Harduin*, T. III. and IV. Of the Byzantines, the Chronicle of *Theophanes* Confess. († before 820), and the Breviar. hist. of *Nicephorus*, Patr. of Const. († 828) in Ang. Mai Nov. PP. Bibl., V. I. 146. (Tr.) *Theodori Studitae* († 826) opp. ed. Sirmond. opp. var. 1. *Georgii Hamartoli*, Chron. ed. E. de Muralto, Petersburg, 1865. *Acta S. Andreae* in Act. SS. Bolland. Oct. VIII., p. 124 sq.—*Goldast*, imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum in utroque imperio promulgata, Francofurti, 1608. *Joannis Damasceni* *Λόγοι ἀπολογητικοὶ πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας* (Opp. ed. *le Quien*, T. I., p. 305. sq.) The principal documents, in *Rösler's* Patristic Library, Pt. X., p. 474–568.

II. *Maimbourg*, Hist. de l'hérésie des Iconoclastes, 2 vols., Paris, 1679. *Natal. Alex.* dissert. adv. vet. novosque iconomachos ac praesertim contra, libb. IV. (Carolin.) (hist. eccl. saec. VIII.) *Schlosser*, Hist. of the Iconoclast Emperors of the Eastern Empire, Frkft. 1812. *Katerkamp*, Ch. H., V. IV., p. 40–96.

---

[1] Such a passage is Deuteron. xxxiii. 2: "The Lord came from Sinai, and from Seir he rose up to us: He hath appeared from mount Pharan." It was pretended that these words foretold the revelation by *Moses*, that by *Christ* (since it is said that Seir is a mountain of Galilee), and by *Mohammed*. But the mountain Pharan is altogether too far away from Hedshaz and Mecca to be considered as in any way connected with Mohammed. See *Döllinger*, Man'l of Ch. H., Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 313. Nay, the Mohammedans even accused the Christians of having erased the name of Mohammed from the Bible, and insisted that Christ said: "I announce to you that a prophet shall come after me whose name is *Muometh*." See *Phrazes* in his corp. script. hist. Byzant., Bonn, 1838, p. 340.

†*Marx*, The Iconoclasm of the Byzantine Emperors, Treves, 1839. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. III., p. 335–457. *Palma*, Praelect. hist. eccl., T. II., Pt. II., p. 3–43.

While the Moslems were living peaceably, side by side with the Christians, and both were, to all appearance, daily cultivating more friendly relations with each other, there was no concealing the fact that the followers of Mohammed had taken deep offense at the prevailing and growing use of images in the Christian churches—a practice which the law-giver of Mecca had emphatically condemned from the very outset of his career. The aversion to the use of images, manifested by the first Christians, was early overcome by the decided taste for the fine arts innate in the character of the Greeks and still strong among them, and by the requirements of popular devotion, of which visible signs and symbols are the natural expression. It can not, however, be denied that the use of images, in itself so perfectly legitimate, had gradually given rise to many and glaring abuses, such as the practice of employing them as sponsors for children and decking them in all sorts of unbecoming adornments. These abuses were at once the cause and occasion of a turbulent reaction, which, as is usual in such cases, defeated its own purpose by going beyond the limits of legitimate protest and condemning even a rational use of images, and led to a contest more sanguinary and violent than any which the dogmatic controversies had excited in the East. Nay, more; so terrific was the iconoclastic struggle, while it lasted, that it destroyed the peace of the Church and threatened the destruction of the *State*.

The origin of this deplorable controversy is usually ascribed to Leo the *Isaurian*, a rude and ignorant soldier, who, rising from the humblest walks of life, finally succeeded, by the aid of the army, in reaching the imperial throne (A. D. 717). Having already employed violent measures to compel the Jews to receive baptism, and driven the Montanists to such a degree of desperation that they frequently resorted to suicide to escape his tyranny, he next turned his attention to the task of suppressing the use of images. He brought to the contest the fierce spirit of the law-giver of Mecca rather than the moderation of the one of Sinai, declaring "he could not endure that Christ should be represented under the form of a dumb and senseless figure, made of coarse material and bedaubed with vulgar colors, and that such representations would shock both Jews and Mohammedans and repel them from Christianity."[1] He therefore assumed the office of a self-constituted reformer of the Church, and set about putting an end to this superstition. He commenced by ordering Pope Gregory II. to have the images and paintings on the walls of the churches raised sufficiently high to be beyond the reach of the embraces and kisses of the devout multitude, thus, as he thought, preventing profanation and removing the occasion of sin.

Finding that his order was ineffectual, he published, in the year 726, in spite of the representations and protests of *Germanus,* Patriarch of Constantinople, and other theologians of the capital, an edict forbidding the veneration of statues, images, and mosaics, and branding the practice as idolatrous.

This edict was shortly followed by a second (c. A. D. 730) of a far more severe and sweeping character, ordering the complete destruction of all images throughout the Western Empire. No words can convey an adequate idea of the agitation and tumult which followed its promulgation. The question, unlike any abstruse definition of a dogma, or authoritative solution of a subtle point of metaphysics, was within the comprehension of the multitude, and bore directly upon their religious life and devotional habits. It has been said that if an order were issued at the present day, commanding the breaking and destroying of all the statues and images of the Blessed Virgin set up along the country highways and metropolitan thoroughfares of any Catholic country of Europe, no such revulsion of feeling would take place as that which followed the promulgation of Leo's edict. The soldiers charged with its execution were treated with every sort of indignity, and frequently lost their lives in endeavoring to carry its instructions into effect.

---

[1] The use of images, besides being a stumbling-block to Mohammedans, as was maintained, was objectionable to the Iconoclastic emperors for other reasons. They insisted—1. That images had been forbidden in the Old Law; 2. That painting and sculpture were eminently Pagan arts; 3. That it was entirely unbecoming and sinful to represent Christ and his Saints by lifeless matter; 4. That to represent Christ under human form was to give rise to a *tertium quid,* inasmuch as, though the human attributes might, the Divine attributes could not, be limited by forms of sense, and consequently the image would be something giving no adequate or correct representation of the Person of Christ, thus leading to the Eutychian or Monophysite errors; or that, if this conclusion were rejected, the only alternative left was to take refuge in Nestorianism, and, by maintaining that Christ could be represented under human and sensible forms, admit that the Persons might be separated in Him, and His Humanity have a self-subsistent existence of its own. The true solution of the whole difficulty, and the motive which prompted imperial action, are to be sought in the meddlesomeness of those emperors who, like their predecessors in regard to the earlier dogmatic controversies, were always interfering in ecclesiastical legislation.

Above the bronze portal of the imperial palace stood a magnificent image of Christ,[1] which was held in great reverence by the people. According to Theophanes and Cedrenus, the destroying of this was the occasion of a popular tumult, in which many of the participants paid with their lives the penalty of their devotion. When a soldier of the imperial guard had placed a ladder against the gateway, for the purpose of taking down the image, a number of ladies collected around begged him to spare it for their sakes. But, instead of heeding their remonstrances and acceding to their wishes, he struck the face of the image a blow with his ax—an act which so wounded the religious sensibilities, and so excited the indignation of the ladies, that, forgetting for a time the gentleness of their sex, and yielding to the fierce impulse of the moment, they drew the ladder from under the soldier's feet, precipitated him to the ground, set upon and murdered him.

The chief opposition came from the monks who supplied the images and the bulk of the people who entertained great reverence for them.

The Emperor's anger was still more inflamed against the iconolaters by the conduct of one Kosmos, who, taking advantage of the popular indignation against the Emperor, raised the standard of rebellion in Greece. The insurrection was speedily suppressed, and Kosmos apprehended and executed; but the event itself afforded Leo a plausible excuse for pursuing his iconoclastic policy with greater energy.

---

[1] The so-called ἀντιφωνήτης = warrantor, because, as the legend went, it had, on one occasion, given security for the payment of money borrowed by a pious sailor.

In the year 730, he entered upon a systematic warfare against images (*εἰκονοκλασμός*), which he carried on with unremitting severity till the day of his death, A. D. 741.

Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had already reached the venerable age of ninety-six, having refused to comply with the Emperor's wishes, was deposed and superseded by *Anastasius*, the secretary and compliant tool of Leo. But, if he could thus dispose of Germanus, he had no such power over *John of Damascus*, the greatest theologian of his day, and who, living under the government of the Caliphs, and having no reason to fear the anger of Leo, published three exceedingly able discourses in defense of the proper use of images. Both *Gregory II.* and *Gregory III.* protested emphatically against the imputation cast upon the Church by the Emperor, of having for eight hundred years tolerated and favored an idolatrous worship. They stated that no Christian could be persuaded to believe that there was anything divine in the material statue or picture itself, or that any divine virtue resided in it, and that consequently they could not worship it; that the most illiterate person and the feeblest intellect could distinguish between the downright adoration of images and the relative homage that might be paid to them because of the originals which they represented; and that the prohibitions formerly laid upon the Jews were not applicable to the Christians, because, since Christ, the second Person of the Adorable Trinity, had become incarnate and assumed the form of man, His representation as such was both possible and admissible.

Such churches as might defy the power and escape the resentment of Leo, at once cut the Iconoclasts off from their communion. In the year 731, Gregory III. convoked a council at Rome, attended by ninety-three bishops, in which sentence of excommunication was passed upon *all* enemies of holy images. The Emperor, now under sentence of excommunication, determined to take revenge upon the Pope, and sent a fleet against Rome, which was dispersed by a storm, and wrecked in the Adriatic Gulf. After this failure, he contented himself with confiscating those portions of the Patrimony of St. Peter situated in Calabria and Sicily, and transferring Greece and Illyricum from the Roman to the Byzantine patriarchate. Leo labored for a period of twelve years in the vain attempt to root out a religious principle deeply seated in the minds of earnest Christians, and at his death (A. D. 741) beheld his empire distracted in both East and West, and his purpose as far from its accomplishment as at the commencement of his reign. His son and successor, *Constantine Copronymus*[1] (A. D. 741–775), surpassed even his father in the malignant hatred with which he pursued the defenders of images throughout his empire. The controversy had been heretofore mainly a religious one, but it now assumed a different aspect, and took the character of a political contest.

During the first year of Constantine's reign, and while he was absent on an expedition against the Saracens, a report of his death having got abroad, the advocates of the use of images rose in revolt, and placed *Artabasdus*, the Emperor's brother-in-law, on the imperial throne. The usurper, who, to gain the affections of the people, proclaimed himself the protector of such as opposed Iconoclasm, was unable to retain possession of the throne, and having been defeated by Constantine, November 2, A. D. 743, paid dearly for his rashness and ambition. Constantine had both him and his son bound in chains, exposed in the hippodrome, and, after having put this indignity upon them, ordered their eyes to be plucked out. All the adherents of the usurper underwent a punishment equally cruel. His anger bore still more heavily upon the unfortunate and vacillating *Anastasius*, who, having been an iconoclast under Leo, changed sides under Artabasdus, and, after having suffered the most terrible cruelties in punishment of his relapse, again veered about, and, upon his restoration to the patriarchate, became the submissive and subservient tool of Constantine. The unworthy patriarch did all in his power to facilitate the carrying out of the emperor's designs. He crowned his son, who was then associated with his father in the government of the empire—a measure intended to secure the permanency of Constantine's dynasty.

---

[1] So called from κόπρος, dirt, because, at his baptism, he defiled the baptismal font.

Constantine availed himself of a most opportune moment, when the Lombards were seriously threatening the Pope, to renew and add to the severity of his decrees against the use of images. In order to secure the good-will and co-operation of the bishops, he amused each in turn with the flattering hope or promise of the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, left vacant by the death of Anastasius (A. D. 753.)

He also summoned, in the next year, the bishops to meet in council at the capital, to provide measures for the complete suppression of the use of images. This council afterward aspired to the more pretentious title of the Seventh Ecumenical. It assembled in the Hieria palace, opposite Constantinople, was attended by three hundred and thirty-eight bishops belonging to Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece; and was presided over by *Theodosius* of Ephesus, but among its members there was not a single one of the Oriental patriarchs. The patriarchate of Constantinople was still vacant, and those of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem were under Mohammedan dominion.

Although the great majority of the bishops condemned in their hearts the principles of Iconoclasm, yet they consented to become facile tools of the Emperor, and descended to the meanness of doing his bidding. They denounced the art of painting as accursed and blasphemous, and as the invention of the devil; declared that such as should manufacture or pay reverence to images, or set them up either in churches or in private houses, should, if ecclesiastics, be deposed, and, if laymen, be cut off from the communion of the Church, after which they were to be handed over to the civil authority, to be dealt with according to the ordinances of the imperial laws; and finally, as if to fill the measure of their ignominious abasement, they anathematized *Germanus*, the deceased Patriarch of Constantinople, *Gregory* of Cyprus, and *John of Damascus.*[1]

The Pope, and the three Oriental patriarchs living under the Mohammedan government, condemned the decrees of this synod. This action was followed by a new and more decided opposition to the Emperor, on the one hand, and, on the other, by a more bloody and relentless persecution of the advocates of images.

Monasteries were demolished, libraries destroyed, and monks given the alternative of marrying or quitting the country. Many of them were chucked into sacks, had stones tied about their necks, and were cast into the sea; others had their eyes plucked, and were dragged through the streets of the city.

Among the most resolute of those who withstood the imperial tyranny was the famous abbot, *Stephen* the Younger, who dwelt in the grotto of Auxentius, on a lofty mountain near Constantinople. He inspired the monks, who flocked to him in great numbers, with his own courage and resolution, but advised such as felt any diffidence of their fortitude to retire to distant districts in the East and West. The Emperor, conscious of the importance of having a man of such influence espouse his cause, dispatched a person of high rank to him with a present of dried figs, dates, and such other fruits as the monks subsisted on. Stephen rejected the insidious overture, declaring that he would not accept the gift of a heretic, nor deny his faith, and that he was ready to die for the image of Christ. When summoned before the Emperor, drawing from his cowl a piece of coin bearing the Emperor's effigy, he said: "What punishment shall I suffer if I trample this under my feet?" And, having thrown the coin down, he trod upon it, whereupon he was cast into prison for so insulting the imperial effigy; thus demonstrating, by an *argumentum ad hominem*, that reverence paid to an image might be transferred to the original.

Upon entering the prison, he found there three hundred and forty-two monks, some with their hands, some with their ears, and some with their noses cut off; others whose eyes had been bored out, and all awaiting sentence of death.

---

[1] Conf. *Hefele*, Ch. H., V. III., p. 379–386.

Leo IV. (A. D. 775–780), who succeeded Constantine, adopted the same principles and pursued the same policy as his father; and if his measures were somewhat less severe, it was, in a great measure, due to the influence of his wife, Irene, an Athenian lady and a devout advocate of the use of images. Discovering that the use of images had been introduced into the imperial household, Leo severely punished such as were implicated in this act of disobedience to the existing edicts, and, during the remaining four years of his reign, enforced the obnoxious laws with greater rigor. Upon the death of the Emperor, in the early part of the year 780, *Irene*, aided by the advocates of images, whom she had often befriended at great risk to herself, assumed the reins of government during the minority of her infant son, Constantine VI., surnamed Porphyrogenitus, a boy only ten years of age. She was also instrumental in convoking the Seventh Ecumenical Council.

Paul, the iconoclastic patriarch of Constantinople, previously to his death, expressed regret that he had consented to be set over a church separated from the communion of the Catholic world, and recommended as his successor *Tarasius* (A. D. 784), the former private secretary of the empress Irene, a man of austere life and great learning, who would consent to accept the dignity only on condition that the unity of the Church should be restored, and that Pope *Hadrian* would convoke an ecumenical council for that purpose. Pope Hadrian received Tarasius again into the Church, and wrote to the empress, who had sent a deputation of bishops to Rome, to request him to direct the action of the council.

SEVENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, A. D. 787.

This council held the first of its eight sessions at Constantinople, A. D. 786, but owing to the disturbances raised by the troops, who were still attached to the memory of Leo and Constantine Copronymus, it was adjourned, and met again at *Nice*, A. D. 787.

There were present, besides the two papal legates, *Peter*, Archpriest of St. Peter's, and another *Peter*, Abbot of St. Sabas, who presided over the council, more than three hundred bishops, either in person or by representation, and a great number of monks and ecclesiastics not entitled to vote. The patriarch Tarasius, though occupying a position below the papal legates in the council, directed its proceedings. In accordance with the requirements of Pope Hadrian, the acts of the so-called council of 754 were rescinded. The teaching set forth in his letter relative to the proper respect to be paid to images was accepted, first by Tarasius, and afterward by the whole council. After a full discussion of the point at issue, the council declared that a rational use of images was perfectly lawful.

In the seventh session, a document was drawn up by Tarasius, specifying what objects were included under the term *images*, and defining the kind of reverence due to them, a report of which was also sent to Constantine and Irene.

It was here declared that not only the sign of the Cross, but also images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, of angels, and of holy and devout men, drawn in color, composed of mosaic work, or made of other suitable material, might be placed in church, upon sacred vessels and vestments, on walls and tables, and be set up along the highways. The proper sense of the word *προςκυνεῖν*, as expressing the honor to be paid to men, was then fully stated and explained according to its biblical and patristic use. The council then went on to repudiate the imputation of idolatry in the use of images, in the following terms: "Bowing or prostrating oneself before an image (*τιμητικὴ προςκύνησις*), which is simply a token of love and a relative honor (*σχετικὴ τροςκύνησις*) rendered to the original, should not be confounded with the *adoration* (*λατρεία*) *which is due to God alone.* Christians," it continued, "do not call images gods, neither do they serve them as gods, nor place their hopes of salvation in them, nor expect future judgment at their hands; but, while refusing to pay them the honor due to God, they salute them out of respect to the memory of those they represent, and as a token of the love they entertain for the originals."

At the close of the seventh session, the council was directed, by an imperial order, to repair in a body to Constantinople, where the eighth and last session was held, on the twenty-third day of October, in the imperial palace of Magnaura. The empress Irene and her son, Constantine, were in attendance, surrounded by a vast concourse of people. The empress ordered the decrees which had been passed to be publically read, and, after having asked the bishops if these expressed the sense of the whole council and received an affirmative answer, accompanied with repeated acclamations, she had them placed before herself and her son, both of whom signed them. The council was then solemnly closed.

Constantine VI. came of age A. D. 791. The next six years were passed in a contest with his mother to obtain the reins of government. Irene finally gained the upper hand, and enjoyed five years of sole rule, when she was dethroned in a rebellion, headed by her secretary, Nicephoros, and banished to the island of Lesbos, where she died in the following year.

During his reign (A. D. 802–811) and that of his successor, *Stauracius*, which lasted only a few months, and of *Michael I.*, surnamed *Rhangabes* (A. D. 811–813), the controversy was carried on with less vehemence and bitterness. But when Michael, feeling himself unequal to the task of governing an empire, resigned in favor of *Leo V.* (A. D. 813–820), surnamed the *Armenian*, and retired into a monastery, it again broke out with increased violence. This emperor, nicknamed the *Chameleon*, because at his coronation he refused to make any profession of faith, permitted a number of synods to be held, the most notable of which is that of the year 816, presided over by *Theodorus Cassiteras*, a layman of noble birth, but of iconoclastic antecedents, being a collateral descendant of Constantine Copronymus, and whom Leo had raised to the patriarchal throne. This synod annulled the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (A. D. 787), and reasserted those of the synod held at Constantinople, A. D. 754. This action was followed by an imperial edict, said to have been inspired by *John the Grammarian* and Theodorus Cassiteras, the leaders of the Iconoclasts, who persuaded the emperor that the unhappy condition of his empire should be ascribed to the idolatry of his subjects, and regarded as a punishment of God upon their infidelity. They also foretold that his reign would be long and glorious if he would follow out the policy pursued by his predecessor, Leo the Isaurian. The emperor, acting upon the faith of this prophecy, ordered many monks and ecclesiastics who favored the use of images, to quit the country. Some of these were received into the monastery of *St. Praxedis*, at Rome, by the reigning Pope, *Pascal*, and others were consoled in their exile by letters written from his prison by the intrepid *Theodore the Studite.*

Michael II., surnamed the *Stammerer* (A. D. 820–829), recalled the exiles in the early part of his reign, but, later on, adopted the persecuting policy of his predecessors. Theodore the Studite, who was allowed to return with the rest, still proving intractable, was again banished, and died in exile, A. D. 826.

Michael was succeeded by his son *Theophilus* (A. D. 829–842), who had been educated by Theodorus Cassiteras, and had imbibed all his hatred against the use and veneration of images. He was the most bitter and cruel of all the iconoclastic emperors. He expressed his determination to sweep the whole tribe of monks from the face of the earth, and is said to have martyred the whole confraternity of *Abrahamites* on an island in the Euxine Sea. He scourged some, imprisoned others, and burnt the hands of Lazarus, a celebrated painter, with hot iron bars, to prevent him from ever again engaging in his hated art. He undertook a discussion with some of the Catholic party, among the most famous of whom were the two brothers, *Theophanes* the singer and *Theodore* the illuminator, upon whose faces he branded some offensive iambics composed by himself.

But if he despised, his wife, *Theodora*, secretly favored, the iconolaters. Upon the death of her husband, A. D. 842, *Michael III.*, afterward known as *The Drunkard*, being still a minor, Theodora became regent. She recalled the banished monks, and summoned a synod to meet at Constantinople (A. D. 842), at which the decrees of the Second Council of

Nice (A. D. 787) were reaffirmed, and the Iconoclasts (*εἰκονοκλάσται*) anathematized.

On the nineteenth of February of the same year, a solemn procession, headed by the patriarch, the clergy, the empress and her son, moved around the Church of St. Sophia, and the day has ever since been observed in the Eastern Church as the *Feast* of *Orthodoxy*, or thanksgiving for the final overthrow of the iconoclastic heresy (*ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας*).

The Eighth Ecumenical Council (A. D. 869) repeated the condemnation of the *Iconoclasts.*

From a *theological* point of view, there was an end of the controversy. The question, which had disturbed the Church for above one hundred and twenty years, had been set at rest forever by a clear and precise definition, after a thorough and candid examination of all the controverted points.

But from a *political point of view*, the case was very different. From the breaking out of the controversy, there had been a manifest and ever-growing alienation of the Western from the Eastern half of the Roman Empire, which ended in a complete separation of the two, under the respective names of the *Byzantine* and the *Germano-Frankish Empires.*

B.—THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY IN THE FRANKISH EMPIRE.

Augusta conc. Nicaeni II. censura seu libri Carolini, anno 790, ed. 1549. *Eli Phili* (pseudonymous; properly *J. du Tillet*, Bp. of St. Brieux, afterward of Meaux; he is suspected of Calvinism), according to the *single* Codex, now kept in the library of the Arsenal at Paris, which is either entirely or partly the work of a forger. The Codex, of which Archbishop *Hincmar* of Rheims availed himself, and the Codex Vaticanus, from which the Apostolic Librarian, *Steuchus*, made his quotations, have hitherto remained lost without a trace; ed. *Heumann*, Hanov. 1731; also in *Goldasti* Imperat. decret., p. 67 sq., and in *Migne*, ser. lat., T. 98, printed from *Phili's* text. Conf. *Claudius Taurin.*, de cultu imaginum (fragmenta), and *Dungali* lib. respons. (Max. Bibl., T. XIV.; Bibl. Patrist. Colon., T. IX., Pt. II., p. 875 sq.) Acts in *Mansi*, T. XIII.–XIV., and *Harduin*, T. IV. Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. III., p. 651–673.

Anterior to the breaking out of the present controversy, the Christians inhabiting the western provinces of the Roman Empire had possessed a clear and intelligent knowledge of the use of images, according to the mind of the Church. Images had been employed by them to adorn churches, to enhance the solemnity of public worship, and to awaken and quicken faith and devotion. The liveliness of Oriental imagination, always liable to giddy flights and dangerous excesses, was less to be feared among the more phlegmatic populations of the West. The Germans, of all people, were the least in danger of being carried away by an unruly fancy, inasmuch as they had never worshiped their divinities under the form of pictorial representations, and but seldom as personified in the objects and phenomona of nature. No considerable trace of idolatrous worship appeared among them until much later; and when idolatry did make its appearance, it came associated with many other elements distinctively Pagan, and was difficult to root out. To banish it in the Frankish Empire required a vigorous and well-sustained effort. When the decrees of the Greek councils were made known in the West, they were but ill-received—1. Because the people had not yet acquired a taste for the fine arts, and did not feel the want of representing persons and events by images; 2. Because the Germans, who had now become idolaters, might excuse their own practice by appealing to the use of images among Christians; and, 3. Because the Germans, who, unlike the Orientals, never fell prostrate before their kings as a mark of reverence, and humbled themselves to God alone, might not fully comprehend—nay, probably entirely misconceive—the meaning and import of the term προςκύνησις.

A defective translation of the acts of the Second Council of Nice had been sent to Charlemagne by Pope Hadrian I., which, after having been further mutilated by ignorant and blundering copyists, was submitted to a number of theologians. The worst apprehensions were verified.

The acts of the council were severely and unjustly censured in the so-called *Caroline Books* (Quatuor Libri Carolini), composed (A. D. 790) in part by Charlemagne, but chiefly by the English Alcuin and other ecclesiastics.[1] The natural vehemence of the French theologians and the irritation of Charlemagne, whose proposed match between the princess Rothrud and Constantine, the son of Irene, had been rejected by the latter, gave point and emphasis to this theological treatise.

---

[1] The contents of these Books are, in substance, as follows: 1. Both Eastern synods, the Iconoclastic of 754 and the Iconolatric of Nice (787), are equally "infames" and "ineptissimae," and both transgress the boundaries of truth. 2. Adoration and worship are due only to God—He alone is "adorandus" and

Owing either to the faulty translation of the Conciliar Acts or to the omission of a negative particle[1] by an oversight of the copyist, the following blasphemous utterance was attributed to the Nicene Fathers: "I bestow service or adoration on images of the saints even as on the Divine Trinity;" whereas the council had been specially careful to distinguish between the reverence due to images and the adoration to be given to God alone (*ἡ κατα λατρείαν προςκύνησις*).

Thus misled, the three hundred bishops who assembled at the Council of Frankfort, summoned by Charlemagne, A. D. 794, to consider the errors of Adoptionism, decided against the veneration, while allowing the use of images.[2]

"colendus," but not the creature. 3. The saints are but "venerandi," and only an "opportuna veneratio" must be rendered to them. 4. There do indeed occur instances of an "adoratio" of men, consisting in a bow or a kiss; yet are these acts employed only "salutationis causa," and out of a sense of love or humility. 5. Even this kind of "adoratio" must not be paid to pictures, for they are without life, and the works of the hands of men. They may be retained—*a*. As an ornament of churches; and, *b*. In commemoration of past events—but all "adoratio" and all "cultura" must be avoided. 6. It matters not whether they be kept or not; they are not necessary, and it was wholly wrong in the Nicene synod to have threatened with anathema all those who do not revere images. 7. Images must not be put on a par with the cross of Christ, or with Holy Writ, the sacred vessels, and the relics of the bodies or garments of the saints. All these things, according to ancient tradition, are venerated in the West, but not images. 8. It is foolish to burn lights or incense before pictures. 9. If they be deemed sacred, then must they not be put in dirty places—e. g. by the roadside, as is done by the Greeks. Conf. the Analysis in *Hefele's* Hist. of Councils, Vol. III., p. 655 sq. *Piper*, Introd. to Monumental Theol., p. 219 sq.

[1] They read there: "Suscipio venerandas imagines, et quae secundum servitium adorationis, quae substantiali et vivificae Trinitati emitto," wherefore the council is styled "synodus ineptissima, pseudosynodus;" while in the correct translation of *Anastasius* it is said: "Suscipio et amplector venerabiles imagines; adorationem autem, quae fit secundum λατρείαν, tantummodo supersubstantiali et vivificae Trinitati conservo."

[2] Concil. Francfort. in *Mansi*, T. XIII., p. 909. Special attention is here directed to the Second Canon, which, while approving the Libri Carolini, attributes views wholly false to the Second Council of Nice, or, as it is here

In the year 824, the Greek emperor *Michael* the *Stammerer* dispatched an embassy to *Louis* the *Mild*, successor to Charlemagne, for the purpose of renewing bonds of confederation, and with a view of bringing him over to the principles of the Iconoclasts. Louis assembled a council at Paris (A. D. 825), which, owing to Greek influence and the powerful opposition of *Claudius*, Bishop of Turin, rejected the Council of Nice and charged Pope *Hadrian* with having favored the superstition of the Greeks.

This action is all the more surprising, inasmuch as the editor of the Caroline Books, probably Alcuin, notwithstanding the bitterness with which he assails the Greeks and the Oriental court, accusing both of a lack of genuine dignity and manliness, declares repeatedly that while it is forbidden to *adore* (adorare), it is permitted to revere images; and that, while, guarding against any superstitious veneration of images,[1] the faithful should not contemptuously despise such as serve for the adornment of churches or the edification of the faithful.

After Pope Hadrian had become acquainted with the char-

---

called, that of Constantinople: "Allata est in medium quaestio de nova Graecorum synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in qua scriptum habebatur, ut qui imaginibus Sanctorum, ita ut Deificae Trinitati, servitium aut adorationem non impenderent, anathema judicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi Patres nostri adorationem et servitium renuentes contempserunt, atque consentientes condemnaverunt."

[1] The following passage in the Libri Carolini deserves special attention: "*Permittimus* imagines Sanctorum, quicunque eas formare voluerint, tam in ecclesia quam extra ecclesiam *propter amorem Dei et Sanctorum ejus;* adorare vero eas nequaquam cogimus, qui noluerint." It will be noted that it is here implied that the Nicene Council wished to force (cogimus) persons to adore images, whereas, in matter of fact, it did the exact contrary. The canon then goes on: "frangere vero vel destruere eas, etiamsi quis voluerit, non permittimus" (ad act. IV. sub fin.)

For a complete proof of the blundering—nay, even of the dishonesty—of the authors of these Books, see *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, Vol. III., p. 655-673. Their animus is frequently so apparent, that, like many others before him, *Floss*, in his Programme, "De suspecta librorum Carolin. a Joanne Tilio editorum fide," Bonnae, 1860, adduces a number of arguments to support the conjecture, that the Caroline Books were again tampered with, and interpolated by the fierce Iconoclasts of the sixteenth century. Compare, however, *Dr. Nolte's* review of this Programme, in the Vienna Journal of Catholic Literature, year 1861, n. 30.

acter and contents of the Caroline Books, he composed and forwarded to the Emperor a calm and dignified refutation of them, in which, after reaffirming the teachings of *Gregory the Great*, he adds new arguments of his own to establish the doctrine of the veneration of images.

The sophistical reasoning of *Claudius*, Bishop of Turin, and *Agobard*, Archbishop of Lyons, was exposed and confuted by *Jonas*, Bishop of Orleans,[1] but still more ably by *Dungal*, an Irish monk of St. Denys.

Some time subsequently, *Walafried Strabo* and *Hincmar*, Archbishop of Rheims, triumphantly asserted and vindicated the true doctrine relative to the veneration of images by showing the futility of the objections urged against the Council of Nice.

---

[1] *Jonae* de cultu imaginum, libb. III. (max. bibl., T. XIV., p. 167, and bibl. Patrum Colon., T. IX., Pt. I., p. 90 sq.) *Agobardi* lib. ctr. eorum superstitionem, qui picturis et imaginibus Sanctor. obsequium deferendum putant. (Opp. ed. *Masson.*, Par. 1605; castigatus a Steph. *Baluz.*, Par. 1666, 2 vols.; *Galland.* bibl., T. XIII.)

PART SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII., 1073.

§ 178. *Sources. Works.*

SOURCES—I. *Acta Concilior.* in *Mansi*, *Harduin*, *Harzheim;* besides, *Binterim*, Philosophical Hist. of the German Councils, Vol. III. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. IV. Annales Fuldenses, 830–901; Bertiniani, 835–882; *Regino*, Abbot of Prüm († 915) Chronic. 870–907, contin. to 967 (complete in *Pertz*, T. I.) *Annalista Saxo*, 741–1139 (*Eccardi* corp. hist., T. I.) *Flodoard*, Canon of Rheims († 966), Chronicon, 919–960 (*du Chesne*, T. II., in *Bouquet-Dom Brial*, T. V.) *Luitprandi*, episc. Cremon., Hist. rer. ab Europ. imperat. et regib. gestar., libri VI. (*Muratorii*, Scriptor. Ital., T. II., Pt. I., and *Pertz*, T. III.; also published separately, Hanov., 1839.) *Wittichind*, Monk of Corvey († 1000), Annal. de reb. Saxon. gestis (*Meibom.*, T. I., p. 628. Conf. *Leibnitz*, T. I., p. 201; *Pertz*, T. III.) *Ditmari*, Episc. Merseb. († 1018), Chronicon, 876–1028, ed. *Wagner.* Norimb., 1807, 4to; also in *Leibnitz*, T. II., and *Pertz*, T. IV. *Hermanni Contracti*, Monachi Augiens. (Reichenau, † 1054), Chronic. from Christ to 1054 (*Pistorius-Struve*, T. I., with the continuation by *Bertholdus* of Reichenau, and by *Bernoldus* of St. Blasius, in *Ussermann*, Monumenta res Aleman. illustrant., T. I., and in *Pertz*, T. VII.) *Lamberti Hersfeldensis*, Chronic. until 1077, transl. by *Buchholz*, Frkft. 1819 (in *Pertz*, T. VII., and in a separate edition). *Mariani Scoti*, Monachi Fuldens., Chronica down to 1083, and *Sigebertus Gemblacens.*, Chronic. down to 1112 (in *Pertz*, T. VII. and VIII.) Conf. * *Wattenbach*, Germany's Sources of History.

II. *For the Greek Church.* The Byzantines: *Constantinus Porphyrogennetes* († 959) to 886; *Jos. Genesius* (about 940) from 813–867; *Georgius*, Monachus, to 959; *Simeon Logotheta*, to 967; *Leo Grammaticus*, to 1013; *Georg. Cedrenus* made an extract therefrom, to 1057; *Jo. Zonaras*, to 1118. (See the editions of the Byzantines, in our Vol. I., p. 43, n. 1.)

WORKS: *Baronii* Annal. *Fleury*, *Natalis Alex.*, *Stolberg-Kerz*, Vol. 26–36. *Damberger*, Synchronist. Hist., Vol. 3–6. *Hock*, *Gerbert*, or Pope *Sylvester* II., and *Höfler*, The German Popes; *Weiss*, Hist. of Alfred the Great, Schaffhausen, 1852; *Vogel*, Ratherius of Verona, Jena, 1854, shed much light on the tenth and eleventh centuries, so little studied, and so very much misunderstood. For further literature, see above, p. 12, especially the Hist. of Rome, by *Papencordt*, *Gregorovius*, and *Reumont.*

CHAPTER I.

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GERMANS—CONVERSION OF SLAVIC NATIONS.

§ 179. *Christianity in Scandinavia.*

I. *Adam. Brem.* Hist. ecclesiast., libri IV., from Charlemagne to 1076, ed. *Fabricius*, Hamb. 1706, transl. into German, with notes, by *Carsten Misegaes*, Bremen, 1825. *Ejusdem* de situ Daniae et reliquarum, quae trans Daniam sunt, regionum natura, morib. et relig. ed. *Fabricius*, Hamb. 1706 fol. *Remberti*, vita St. Anscharii (*Pertz*, Monum., T. II., *Bolland.* ad I. m. Febr.); German, with notes, by *Carsten Misegaes*, Bremen, 1826, by *Drewes*, Paderborn, 1864. Anskarii St. pigmenta: St. Anscharius' prayers accompanying the psalms, communicated by *Lappenberg*, Hamb. 1844. *Saxonis Grammatici* Hist. Danica, ed. *Klotz*, Lps. 1771, 4to.

II. *Münter*, Ch. H. of Denmark and Norway, Vol. I., p. 266 sq. *Karup*, Hist. of the Cath. Church in Denmark, transl. fr. the Danish into German, Münster, 1863, p. 1–58. *Biographies of Ansgar*, according to Rembertus, by *Krummacher*, Bremen, 1828; by *Reuterdahl*, transl. fr. the Swedish into German by *Mayerhoff*, Berlin, 1837; by *Kraft*, narratio de Anschario, Aquilonar. gentium Apostolo, Hamb. 1840; by *Klippel*, Bremen, 1844. *Böhringer*, Ch. H. in Biographies, Vol. II., Divis. 1, p. 170–228. **Daniel*, St. Ansgar, the Ideal of an Apostolic Messenger (*Theol. Controversies*, Halle, 1843); by †*Tappehorn*, Münster, 1862. Conf. *Gfrörer*, Universal Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 797 sq. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of Denmark, Hamb. 1840 sq., 3 vols., whose *chronological dates* have been generally adopted.

Christianity had been preached to the Saxons during the reign of Charlemagne, and a bishopric had been established at *Bremen*. The tree of faith thus planted on German soil grew up and flourished till its wide-spread and life-giving branches cast their shadow upon the neighboring country of Scandinavia.

The Danish king *Harold*, having been expelled from his own country, sought an asylum at the court of Louis the Mild; and in the year 822, the latter sent an embassy into Denmark to compose the difficulty between the King and the other claimants to the throne. But the embassadors had, besides their political mission, another of quite a different character. They were charged with making arrangement for the establishment of a Christian mission in this Pagan land. Hence the Council of Attigny, with the consent of Pope Pascal I., sent thither, as missionaries, *Ebbo*, Archbishop of Rheims, and the monk *Halitgar*, who, it would seem, lacked the courage and perseverance necessary to contend successfully against the difficulties which at every step beset apostles.

In the year 826, Harold was again driven from his kingdom, and sought refuge with the Emperor at Metz, where he, his wife, and a numerous retinue received baptism. He now conceived the design of giving security and stability to his throne by converting his subjects to the Christian religion. But to undertake a task of such magnitude and difficulty with any hope of success required a missionary of no ordinary gifts, and such was found in the person of *Anschar*, or *Ansgar*, a pious and learned monk of Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, in France—a man who equaled St. Boniface in active zeal and untiring energy.

ANSGAR, THE APOSTLE OF THE NORTH

Ansgar was born not far from Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, A. D. 801. From his earliest youth, he had been religiously inclined, and, after he had grown up, was placed by his parents with the monks of the monastery of Corbie. He was the favorite pupil of Paschasius Radbert, one of the most learned men of his age, and afterward became his assistant. In the year 822, he was removed to a monastery founded not far from Höxter, on the Weser, and which from the parent house received the name of *Corvey*. He here undertook the direction of the monastic school, and preached to the people of the surrounding country.

Ansgar had many visions, in one of which his future destiny was made known to him. Transported to the abode of the saints, a heavenly voice said to him: "Descend to earth, and again return hither crowned with martyrdom." Accompanied by King Harold and one monk, *Autbert* by name, who alone, of all the monks of the monastery, volunteered to share with him the perils and labors of the new mission, he set out for Denmark, A. D. 827. His first care was to establish a school at *Hadeby* for the education of *ransomed Pagan* *slaves*, who he intended should be the future missionaries of their country.

Harold, who had rendered himself obnoxious to his nation by embracing Christianity, was again expelled the country (A. D. 828), and his expulsion extinguished, for the time being, all hope of converting the people to the Christian faith.

But if one field of labor was thus closed against Ansgar, another was opened to him. An embassy which had been sent into Sweden by the emperor Louis, in the year 829, informed him, on their return, that there were many Christians in that country desirous of being better informed as to their religion, and of obtaining priests to minister to them. Autbert, the companion of Ansgar, on his former mission, was compelled by sickness to return to Corvey, where he shortly died.

Witmar, also a monk of Corvey, accompanied *Ansgar* on his second mission, and the two, embarking on a trading vessel, set out for *Sweden*, A. D. 829, taking with them many costly presents for the Swedish king *Olaf*, and a letter of recommendation, in which Ansgar is described by Louis as "the best and most faithful man he had ever known." Having obtained permission from the King to preach the Gospel and baptize such as were willing to embrace Christianity, Ansgar continued his labors for a year and a half, amid the most disheartening difficulties, and, at the close of that period, had the gratification of seeing his efforts crowned with unhoped-for success. He had converted many of the inhabitants, and among them some of rank and importance, and had erected numerous churches. The favorable report which he brought back, of the prospects of Christianity in Sweden, induced the emperor Louis to carry into effect a noble and pious project of his father, Charlemagne. With the permission and by the authority of Pope Gregory IV., he founded the archbishopric of *Hamburg* (A. D. 831), which he intended to serve as a center of operations for the missions of the North, and had Ansgar, though only in his twenty-ninth year, consecrated its first archbishop. He was also created Papal Legate for the countries of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway (A. D. 834).

Owing to the increasing complications of the Frankish Empire, the efforts of Ansgar to propagate the Christian religion in Denmark, whose king, *Horic*, was very hostile to any such enterprise, met with but trifling success. In the year 845, Horic, at the head of a Norman army, attacked and pillaged the city of Hamburg, laid the country waste with fire and sword, and scattered the little flock, some of whom were slain, and nearly all the others led away into captivity. It was only with considerable difficulty that Ansgar succeeded in saving his life and his relics. He now took refuge in the monastery of Turholt, in Flanders, which had been assigned to him by the Emperor, as a source of revenue for his support, on taking the see of Hamburg. But he soon lost even this. After the treaty of Verdun, Turholt became the property of Charles the Bald, who disposed of it to one of his courtiers. The condition of things was somewhat improved, when, in the year 849, Pope Nicholas I., at the request of King Louis the German, united the *two sees of Bremen* and *Hamburg* into one archbishopric, over which Ansgar was set. *Günther*, Archbishop of Cologne, under whose jurisdiction the diocese of Bremen had formerly been, consented to this arrangement, and yielded all his former rights.[1] From this time forward, Ansgar labored indefatigably for the conversion of Denmark and Sweden. By his address he obtained the permission of *Horic*, the Pagan king of Denmark, to preach the Gospel and build churches.

In the year 853, inspired with the zeal of an apostle, Ansgar again visited Sweden, where the mission which he had established in 829 had been destroyed during a popular tumult. His new efforts met with a protracted opposition, and were not received with favor by King Olaf till a fortunate cast of *lots* had reassured the royal mind that the *preaching of the Gospel* might be permitted without detriment to the State. To give security and permanence to his labors, Ansgar established a new mission. He spent the closing days of his life, as he had those of his youth, in laborious missionary work—sometimes in his own archdiocese, but principally in efforts to convert the Danes; and, whether at home or abroad, always subject to the same trials and enduring the same hardships and privations which had been his portion from his early years. He wore a shirt of hair-cloth, earned his living by the toil of his hands, and, by close economy and self-sacrifice, managed to lay by something for the support of his missionary priests and for the purchase of costly presents for Pagan princes whose minds it was necessary to soften and conciliate. After having spent above thirty-four years in laboring for the conversion of the Danes and Swedes, and, when in the sixty-fifth year of his age, he was prostrated by a violent fever for four months, during which time he continued cheerful and serene. He had, in his youth, longed to die the death of a martyr,[1] but this blessing was not granted him. Having received Holy Communion, he repeated, as long as he could speak, the words, "Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner; into Thy hands I commend my spirit;" and died, on the day revealed to him in a vision, viz., the day after the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, February 3, A. D. 865.[2]

---

[1] *D'Aix*, de Ecclesiae metropolitanae Coloniensis in Bremensem olim suffraganeam jure metropolitano primitivo, Bonnae, 1792.

Rembert, the disciple and successor of Ansgar, inherited the apostolic spirit of his master. The Church of Denmark was again oppressed by cruel persecutions during the reign of *Gorm*, the *Old*, king of Lithra, in Zealand, who, in the year 900, became chief of all the Danish tribes; and Hamburg was again taken and destroyed. But, in the year 934, the German emperor, Henry I., compelled Gorm to cease persecuting the Christians; and *Unni*, who had been Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen since 918, availing himself of this favorable condition of affairs, made a missionary tour to the North, and succeeded in obtaining from the old king the largest toleration for himself and for the Gospel which he preached.

---

[1] *Neander*, Memorabilia, III. 2, p. 125 sq. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. 26, p. 344–419.

[2] Ansgar also left behind him some *written* documents—a diarium, containing the history of his mission, which was (A. D. 1261) sent to Rome by Abbot *Tymo*, but is now missing; moreover, the "*pigmenta*" adduced above, and the vita *St. Willehadi*, the preface of which might well be placed before every life of the Saints.

Harold, surnamed *Blaatand* (Blue Tooth), the son of Gorm, who reigned for fifty years (A. D. 936–986), had already been drawn to the Christian faith by the teachings of his mother, *Thyra*, the daughter of the first Christian Harold, but did not receive baptism until after the disastrous issue of a war with the emperor Otho I. (c. A. D. 965.) An ancient tradition widely diffused among those Northern people, and which seems to be based on truth, states that Harold was brought to the determination of receiving baptism through the instrumentality of a certain priest, *Poppo* by name, a missionary who had come into Denmark from North Friesland. One day, when Poppo was present at a royal banquet, the conversation chanced to turn upon the respective merits of the two religions. The missionary characterized the heathen divinities as evil spirits, and, upon being asked by the King to prove the truth of his assertion by miracle, willingly assented, saying that he would demonstrate, by ordeal, that Christ was God, and thereupon taking up a piece of glowing iron, carried it some distance without scorching his hands.[1]

The religious zeal of Harold soon excited against him the enmity of his Pagan subjects, and brought about his dethronement. His son, *Svend* (A. D. 986–1014), favored the Pagan party, which had placed him on the throne, and threatened to destroy the bishoprics of *Odensee* and *Roskild;* but, after returning from his conquest of England, he became more temperate in his opposition to Christianity in Denmark. His son *Canute* the Great (*Knud*) (A. D. 1014–1030), who had been brought up under Christian influences in England, acting from a motive of duty and at the instance of his consort, the English princess Emma, established Christianity upon a permanent basis in his native land, and was himself drawn more closely to the center of unity by a visit which he made to Rome in the year 1026.[2]

---

[1] *Adam. Brem.* Hist. Eccl., II. 36. Conf. *Gfrörer*, Univ. Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 1291 sq.

[2] *Saxo Grammaticus* (Provost of Roskild? †about 1204) hist., libb. XVI., ed. *Stephanius.* Sor. 1644, 2 T. fol., ed. *Klotz.* Hal. 1771. *Pantoppidan.* annal. eccl. Dan. diplomatici, Hafn. 1741 sq., T. I. *Münter*, l. l. Vol. I., p. 214 sq. *Dahlmann.* Vol. I., p. 99–112.

The conversion of this people, which was as yet only partial and lacking in thoroughness, was much improved by the influence of the new bishoprics of *Lund*, in Schonen, of *Börglum*, and of *Viborg*, in Jutland, established during the reign of *Svend Estrithson*, who died A. D. 1076. Paganism, however, was not at once abolished. Traces of it still survived, and continued to infect the manners of the people and to defile the whiteness of their baptismal robes.

Moreover, *Knud*, surnamed *the Holy*,[1] prompted doubtless by a holy but misguided zeal, collected the tithes with such rigorous exactness, that the people rose against him and put him to death, July 10, A. D. 1086. Urban II., at the request of King Eric, raised *Lund* to the dignity of a metropolitan see, to which the dioceses of both Denmark and Sweden were made suffragan, and those of the latter country continued so until it had obtained a metropolitan of its own.

The seed of faith, which had been sown in Sweden by Ansgar, flourished, came to fullness of growth, and was now ready to be garnered into the storehouse of the Lord. Archbishop *Unni*, quitting his see of Hamburg, passed into Sweden, where he labored during a year in consolidating the institutions of the Church, and, when about to return, died at Birka (c. A. D. 940). His successors in the see of Hamburg were equally zealous and energetic in prosecuting the same work, and sent many missionaries into that country, by whose labors those simple and vivacious sons of nature were attracted to Christianity, and their first king, *Olaf Skötkonung*, drawn into the fold of the one Pastor (A. D. 1008). The first bishopric was established at *Skara*, in West Gothland. King *Inge* (A. D. 1075) destroyed the last remnants of heathenism.[2] King *Swerker* (A. D. 1133–1155) set to work to promote the progress of the Church in a more Christian temper of mind. He invited the monks of St. Bernard into the country, founded monasteries for them, and had the gratification of seeing those noble sons of the Church achieve among his subjects the splendid successes which had followed upon their labors in other lands. The bishopric of *Upsal*, which was established during the reign of *St. Eric* (A. D. 1155–1160), was intrusted to *Henry*, the Apostle of Finland. In the last-named country, the bishopric of *Randamecki* had already been long established, but was transferred in 1200 to *Abo*.

---

[1] Conf. *Dahlmann*, Vol. I., p. 185–203.

[2] *Claudius Oernhjalm*, Hist. Suecorum Gothorumque eccl., libb. IV., Stockholm, 1689, 4to. *Rühs*, Hist. of the Swedes, Halle, 1803, 5 pts.

Pope Alexander III. made Upsal the metropolitan see of Sweden in 1163, with *Skara*, *Linköping*, *Strengnäs*, *Westeräs*, and, at a later period, *Wexio* and *Abo*, as suffragan bishoprics.

It was during their hostile incursions[1] into other lands, that the Norwegians (Norwayans) obtained their first knowledge of Christianity. During the tenth century, several of the Norwegian kings made efforts to introduce it among their subjects. *Harold Haarfagr*, or Harold of the Fair Hair, having made himself master of Sweden, over which he exercised a sort of suzerainty, took an oath in an assembly of the people to sacrifice only to the God of the Christians. His son *Hacon* the *Good* (A. D. 936 until about 951), who had been baptized, and received a Christian education in England, at the court of King Athelstan, returned to Norway while still a young man, and full of zeal for the spread of Christianity. For a time he practiced his devotions in secret, but having gained over to his side a number of the most influential of his subjects, he felt himself sufficiently secure to propose, before an assembly of the people, that the whole nation, without distinction of rank, age, or sex, should embrace the Christian religion. Their answer was prompt and decisive: "How," said they, "can a strange God put any trust in us, if we thus easily relinquish our fealty to the old ones?" The indignation of the people against Hacon for having given up the belief of his ancestors, was so great that he gradually yielded to their demands, till finally his religious practice consisted of a mixture of heathen ceremonies and Christian rites. When dying of a wound received in battle (c. A. D. 960), the grief he felt for having denied his faith weighed so heavily upon his conscience that he declared, should he recover, he would resign his kingdom, retire to a monastery, and pass the remainder of his days in works of penance. The courage displayed by Harold in battle, and the fact that he had lost his life in fighting for his country, produced a reaction in favor of the religion which he had professed and loved so dearly. Moreover, the people felt that as he had participated in their rites, they should treat his belief with toleration, if not with favor. Hence they were, in a measure, favorably disposed toward Christianity when *Harold Blaatand*, King of Denmark, having obtained possession of Norway by treachery, attempted to introduce it into the country (c. A. D. 960). But the powerful Norwegian, *Yarl Hacon*, by whose assistance Harold had obtained possession of Norway, and whom he had appointed Stadtholder, more intent on forwarding his own interests than on serving those of his master, sought to secure his own independence, and recommend himself to the favor of his countrymen by destroying all the Christian establishments which had been set up during the Danish domination. Hacon, having shortly rendered himself odious to the people by acts of oppression, was put aside to make room for *Olaf Trygvesen* (A. D. 996–1000), a Norwegian general, who had traveled in many lands, and gained a knowledge of Christianity, which he embraced, and was baptized at the Scilly Isles, off the southwest coast of England. Olaf had fallen in with a Saxon priest, by name *Thangbrand*, whom he brought with him when returning to his own country, and the two set to work to introduce Christianity by force. The king went about overturning idols, destroying Pagan temples, importuning some and compelling others to receive baptism, and declaring to all that the only purpose of earthly kingdoms is to form citizens for the kingdom of heaven. His reign came to a close in a war against the united powers of Denmark and Sweden, in which he was defeated, and was obliged to leap into the sea to escape the fury of his pursuers.

---

[1] *Dahlmann*, Vol. II., p. 91–97.

Those who held the government after him, being but lieutenants of the kings of Denmark and Sweden, took little or no interest in religious affairs. When, however, *St. Olaf* became king of Norway (A. D. 1019), he at once set about establishing the Church upon a firm basis. He at first experienced much opposition, but being ably seconded in his work by the labors of some English and German missionaries, his efforts were finally crowned with success. He built the magnificent church of St. Clement, at *Nidaros* (Drontheim), the most splendid specimen of architecture in the North; made his subjects take an oath to observe a code of Christian laws, drawn up by Bishop *Grinckel* and the priests residing at his own court; established schools all over his kingdom; destroyed the colossal wooden figure of the god Thor; organized a *crusade*, into which he admitted none but Christians, against *Canute the Great*,[1] King of Denmark and England; and fell mortally wounded, fighting against his heathen subjects, who had allied themselves with the Danes (July 29, A. D. 1030). His tomb at Nidaros was soon frequented by many pious Christians, by whom he was honored as a *Martyr*. The veneration in which his memory was universally held, produced a reaction of public sentiment in favor of Christianity. In the year 1148, Nidaros was raised to the rank of an archbishopric, and the sees of *Bergen*, *Hammer*, and *Stavanger* made its suffragans.

Such of the *Scandinavians* as had quitted their native country and settled among Christians, were, as a rule, quite willing to embrace the faith of Christ. They were no longer influenced by ancient traditions, which gradually lost their hold upon their minds, as distance, time, and new surroundings weakened old beliefs and prejudices, and familiarized new rules of conduct and modes of thought. Thus, for example, the Normans who founded the Eastmannic kingdom of Dublin, in 948, were shortly afterward converted to Christianity. So also *Rollo*, the powerful Norman sea-king, who had been the terror of France for above a quarter of a century, pledged himself by the treaty of *Epte* (A. D. 912) to become a Christian, and, in return, obtained as a fief that portion of northwestern France lying between the Epte and the sea, to which the name of Normandy was afterward given. Rollo, at his baptism, took the name of *Robert*. He wore his baptismal robes for seven days, on each of which he bestowed rich donations on churches. Under his rule, this portion of

---

[1] *Dahlmann*, Vol. II., p. 122–129. Conf. Vol. I., p. 112.

France flourished and prospered. Old and ruined churches were repaired and restored, new ones built, cloisters erected, and on all sides might be seen evidences of peace and contentment. France had then no fairer province than Normandy.

Iceland,[1] that bleak and barren island of the North, was discovered by the Norwegians, in the year 861. Colonists settled there in 870, and founded a free state, which soon became the seat and center of the culture and literature of the Northern Germans. The Gospel was preached to the inhabitants (A. D. 981) by *Frederic*, a Saxon priest, but with little or no success. *Olaf Trygvesen*, King of Norway, also took a warm interest in the conversion of the Icelanders, and sent to them the missionaries *Stefner*, himself an Icelander, *Thangbrand*, a Saxon, and many others. These zealous men announced to the people of Iceland the glad tidings of the Gospel, and labored earnestly for their conversion. The number of Christians was gradually increased by migrations from Norway, and in the year 1000, at the proposal of *Lagmann Thorgeir*, a Pagan priest, who dreaded a civil war, if the people should be divided into two opposing parties, Christianity was formally introduced under the following conditions: 1. That all the inhabitants of the island should receive baptism and profess the Christian religion; 2. That all temples containing idols, and all images exposed to public view, should be destroyed; 3. That any one publicly sacrificing to idols or performing other heathen rites should be banished; 4. That, owing to the barrenness of the island and the great number of its inhabitants, it should be permitted to expose infants and eat horse-flesh; and, 5. That it should be permitted to practice heathen rites *in private.*

It took time, patience, and prudence to entirely extinguish Paganism in the island, but it gradually yielded to the subduing influence of Christianity. English, Irish, and Saxon priests, and even bishops, labored zealously to firmly establish the Church. In the year 1056, *Adalbert*, Archbishop of

---

[1] *Finnt Johannaei* hist. eccl. Islandiae, Hafn. 1772 sq., 4 T. fol. *Münter*, Vol. I., p. 519 sq. *Dahlmann*, Vol. II., p. 106–122.

Bremen, consecrated *Isleif* first Bishop of *Skalholt.* He died, A. D. 1080, in the odor of sanctity. A second bishopric was established at *Horlum*, in 1107, and, from this time forward, Iceland could boast some authors of name and merit, such as *Snorro Sturleson*, who is well known, both for his capacity as a statesman and as the father of Northern history.[1]

The *Faröes*, the *Orcades*, and the *Shetland* islands are indebted to the zeal of *Olaf Trygvesen* for their knowledge of Christianity. A bishopric was established in the Faröes in 1150, of which *Matthias* († A. D. 1157) was the first incumbent. The Icelanders discovered Greenland in 982, and converted its inhabitants to Christianity about the year 1000. It is said that the first bishop of Greenland went thither from *Bremen*, and succeeding ones from Norway.[2] The see was established at *Gardar*.

The conversion of the Northern tribes was an event of the most vital importance to the progress and civilization of Europe;[3] for, as long as these fierce and warlike seamen inhabited or skirted her coasts, her advancement and development were impossible.

§ 180. *The Slavonians and Their Mythology.*

Mone, Hist. of Paganism in Northern Europe, Vol. I., p. 111 sq. *Hanusch*, Doctrine of Slavonic Mythology in its widest acceptation, comprising also ancient Prussian and Lithuanian myths, Lemberg, 1842. *Schaffarik*, Hist. of the Slavic Language and Literature, Buda (Ofen), 1826; the *same*, Origin of the Slaves, Buda, 1828. *Joh. Lasicki*, de diis Samogitar., Basil. 1615; *idem*, de Russorum, Muscovitarum, etc., religione, Spirae, 1582. *Frencel*, de diis Sorabor. et alior. Slavor. (*Hoffmann*, scriptor. rer. Lusat., T. II.) *Naruszewicz*, historya narodu polskiego., T. II. (only nomenclature of Slavic gods). *Narbut*, dzieje starozytne (on Lituania), Wilno, 4 T. *Rettberg*, Ch. H. of Germany, Vol. II., p. 545 sq. *Mickiewicz's* Lectures on the Slavic Literature, 4 vols., Lps. 1849.

Among those nations which came prominently forward during the Middle Ages, the Slavonians are, in numbers and importance, second only to the Germans. They occupied that tract of country lying between the river Saale and the Ural Mountains, and between the Baltic and the Adriatic Seas. Their early history is but little known, being derived, for the most part, from legends of a *later* date, which are not unfrequently disfigured by the hostile representations of the Germans. They produced no native poet to transmit to future generations in popular song an account of their origin and early history; neither were they fortunate enough to have their character, manners, and customs described by another Tacitus.

---

[1] *Snorro Sturleson* († 1241) Heimskringla, ed. *Schoening*, Hafn. 1777 sq., 5 T. fol.; transl. into German, by *Mohnike*, Stralsund, 1835, nro. I., by *Wachter*, Lps. 1835 sq., Vols. I., II. Conf. *Dahlmann*, Vol. II., p. 77 sq. *Gfrörer*, Pope Gregory VII., Vol. II., p. 529 sq.

[2] *Torfaei* Groenland. antiqua, Hafn. 1706. *Münter*, Vol. I., p. 555 sq.

[3] *Adam. Bremens.*, de situ Dan., c. 96.

Slav (their real name being Slowene or Slowane), the *generic* and distinctive appellation of this people, has, from the seventh century onward, been variously derived from *slawa* (fame), *slowez* (man or mankind), and perhaps more correctly from *slowo* (a word, whence Slovanians and Slavences), meaning "speaking" or "articulate," and hence a confederation *embracing only nations of one tongue.* This derivation is supported by the fact that Slavonic tribes call such as do not belong to them *Niemetz*, or Mutes (in Polish, Nimiec)—a term in general use among all Slavonians, and implying that those designated by it do not enjoy community of language.

The Slavonians first became known in *history* by their conflicts with the Germans; but, even at this early period, they had *ceased* to be distinguished for sterling *independence* and nobility of character.[1] Of large and compact frame and well-formed head, they seemed incapable of fatigue and insensible to pain. Being by nature courageous and active, they opened an attack with gallantry and conducted it with skill. They were, in social life, frugal, good-natured, and hospitable; were uniformly cheerful, and gifted with an inexhaustible fund of gaiety, which, at their popular feasts, rose to hilarity and boisterousness. Their popular songs, which were numerous, were, at times, spirited and cheerful, and again, tender and mournful. Accustomed to live under Asiatic despots and tyrants, they were fully imbued with the spirit of passive obedience; but what was still more astonishing was the wonderful capacity they possessed of adopting the manners and acquiring the language of any people among whom they chanced to live.

---

[1] *Heffiner*, The struggle of the Germans and Slavonians for the possession of a great part of the world, Hamburg, 1847.

Unlike the Germans, the Slavonians did not regard their women as companions and equals; but, like all Asiatic peoples, treated them with contempt, and looked upon their wives as no better than their slaves. Mothers were allowed to destroy their female infants immediately after birth; and a wife was frequently obliged to share the fate of her husband, and to cast herself into the fire that consumed his body

As there was a community of language, so was there also one of *religious* belief among all the branches of the Slavonic family. It is probable that their religion consisted, at first, like that of the Germans, of a pure worship of nature; but it was not long before they acknowledged an extravagant number of deities which Christian annalists have designated by *Roman* names.

They appear to have had only a vague idea of a "Being Supreme and Eternal," from whom, as was natural with a people of corrupt and unchastened imaginations, they derived, through *Bieloboq* and *Czernobog*, the Black God and the White, a numerous progeny of inferior divinities belonging to either class, in which, as has been demonstrated by *Hanush* in his Slavic Mythology, it is easy to discover the prominent features of Persian Dualism. There was a community of religious worship, not only in each of the several branches of the Slavonic family, but even among those nations which were under different and distinct governments. There were sanctuaries at which all worshiped, and which served as a bond of union among tribes having no political connection. Such were the temple at Arcona, on the island of Rügen, where Swantewits, the four-headed idol, was adored; that at Rhetra, and others. It is said that the chief-priest of Nowgorod maintained an intercourse with the priests of Courland and Semgallia. Among the more popular shrines were those of *Perun*, at Kiew and Nowgorod, who was honored among the Russians and Moravians as the God of Thunder; that of *Swantewit*, at Arcona; that of *Radegast*, the God of Friendship, at Rhetra; that of *Shiva*, the Goddess of Life; and that of *Lado*, the Goddess of Love and Beauty.

Besides the universally honored gods and goddesses, the Poles had a great number of local divinities. A belief in *ghosts* was general and deep-seated. The elements, and every form and aspect of nature, were regarded as the manifestations and abodes of an equal number of inferior divinities, of good and evil genii. These were honored in the gloom of sacred groves and on the banks of rivers, but were not at first represented under any sensible form. The images of the gods, which were introduced at a later date, were entirely destitute of all artistic merit, frequently having many heads and many faces. Thus the statues of *Triglaw*, at Stettin and at Julin, had each three heads, and that of *Swantewit*, at Arcona, four. Human beings were not unfrequently sacrificed to render the gods propitious. The *priests* who participated in this sacrificial worship were highly honored and very influential. They made their influence felt in the family and in nearly every department of social life. On every Monday, the day consecrated to *Prowe*, the Goddess of Justice, they held court and adjusted difficulties. This circumstance will, in a measure, account for the high honor in which the Christian priests were afterward held among the Slavonians, the vast influence which they acquired, and the title of *Prince* (Knez, Xiądz), by which they were known. Hence the title still in use, Xiądz Bisup, Xiądz Proboszez—i. e., Prince Bishop, Prince Parish-priest—the title being usually indicated by X prefixed.

The Slavonians believed that the future life would be no more than a continuation of the present one.

§ 181. *Conversion of Some of the Slavonic Nations.*

Wittichindus, *Ditmarus Merseb.*, *Adam. Bremens.*, at head of § 178. *Helmoldi* (Presbyter at Bosow, †1170), chronica Slavor., ed. Bangert., Lub. 1659, 4to; in *Leibn.* script. Bruns., T. II., p. 537; also in **Pertz*, T. XXI. *Assemanni*, Kalendaria eccles. univ., Rom. 1755, 4to, T. I.–V. *Fabricii* salutaris lux evangelii, etc. *Wegierski*, Systema historico-chronologicum ecclesiarum slavonicarum per provincias varias, praecipue Poloniae, Bohemiae, Lithuaniae, Russiae, Prussiae, Moraviae, etc., distinctarum VIII., libb. IV. continens historiam eccles. a. Chr. ad a. 1650, Trajecti, 1652, 4to. Important: Epistola Episcopor. Germaniae ad Joan. papam VIII. de Slavis ad fidem christ. conversis et eorum archiepiscopo et episcopis (*Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 253 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., P. I., p. 126 sq.) Conf. *Gfrörer*, Univ. Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 1276 sq. For details on *particular* bishoprics, see the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaedia*, under the respective denominations.

The *Croatians* (Crowatians) were the first of the Slavonic nations to embrace Christianity. In the reign of Heraclius, they emigrated from Southern Russia and settled on that tract of land included between the Adriatic Sea and the Danube and Save rivers. Their prince, *Porga*, requested Constantine Pogonatus, to send him Christian missionaries. Constantine referred him to Rome, whence a number of missionaries were obtained, who, in the year 670, baptized the prince and many of his people. The Pope then took this country under his immediate protection, and obliged the inhabitants to give up their habits of plunder and predatory warfare. No positive mention is made of Croatian bishops before the year 879.

The *Servians*, who inhabited ancient Dacia, Dardania, and the sea-coast of Albania, were prevailed upon by the emperor Heraclius to receive baptism shortly after they had come into these countries. But, in the year 827, when they severed their connection with the Greek Empire, they at the same time rejected Christianity, and remained separated until the year 868, when they submitted to the authority of the emperor Basil, and were again converted.

The *Carantani*, who, during the first half of the seventh century, took up their abode in the Windish March, a tract of country including Carinthia, Carnia, and Styria, were converted to Christianity in the course of the eighth century. Their conversion was due, in a great measure, to their intercourse with the city of Salzburg, and to their condition of dependence upon the Frankish Empire. Two of their princes, *Carost* and *Chetumar*, the former the son and the latter the nephew of their chieftain *Boruth*, had, with his consent, received a Christian education in Bavaria. Chetumar, having succeeded to the supreme power in 743, entered into an alliance with the Bavarians. At his request, *Virgilius*, Archbishop of Salzburg, sent Bishop *Modestus* and a number of priests to undertake the conversion of the Carinthians; and in the year 800, *Arno*, his successor in the see of Salzburg, sent Bishop *Dietrich* to labor in this country and among the neighboring Slavonians.

A controversy which broke out in 810 between Arno and *Ursus*, Patriarch of Aquileia, relative to the jurisdiction over Carinthia, was terminated by Charlemagne, who decided that the river Drave should form the boundary line of their respective dioceses. In the year 870, Carinthia, which had hitherto been governed by regionary bishops or vicars, became subject to *Adalwin*, who then occupied the archiepiscopal see of Salzburg.[1]

The *Moravians*, a Slavonic people, who derived their name from that of the river called Morava, and inhabited the territory of the ancient Quadi, which they took possession of in 534, became acquainted with Christianity through means of the military expeditions undertaken by Charlemagne for purposes of conquest. At his request, *Virgilius*, Archbishop of Salzburg, and *Urolf*, Bishop of Passau, sent missionaries into Moravia in the beginning of the ninth century. Urolf forwarded an account of his labors to the Pope, who conferred upon him (A. D. 824) the restored archiepiscopal see of *Laureacum*, with four suffragan bishoprics, two of which were in Moravia. But whether it was that the papal decree was never carried into effect, or that both the suffragan bishoprics and the metropolitan see soon became extinct, it is certain, that, after the death of Urolf, no further mention was made of Laureacum, and that the former jurisdiction of the see of *Passau* reverted to it. There were many obstacles to retard the conversion of the Moravians. They detested Germans and German domination; were ill-disposed toward the missionaries because the latter were ignorant of the Slavic language; and objected to the use of the Latin tongue, with which they were wholly unacquainted, in public service. But the condition of affairs was changed by the arrival of *Cyril*

---

[1] *Anonymi* (priest of Salzburg at the end of the ninth century) de conversione Bojariorum et Carentanorum. (*Oefele*, Scriptor. rer. Boic., T. I., p. 280. *Freher*, Scriptor. rer. Bohemicar. and *Hansizii* Germania sacra, T. II., p. 103 sq.) Conf. *Kleinmayern*, Accounts of Juvavia. Salzburg, 1784 fol., Append., p. 10. *Wattenbach*, Contributions toward a Hist. of the Christian Church in Moravia and Bohemia, Vienna, 1849. *Rettberg*, Vol. II., p. 557 sq.

(Constantine) and *Methodius*, the apostles of the Chazari and the Bulgarians, whom Wratislaw, a Moravian prince, had secured through the kind offices of the Greek emperor, Michael. They arrived in Moravia in the year 863; baptized Prince Wratislaw and his nephew, Svatopluk; invented and brought into general use an alphabet of the Slavonic (Glagolitic) language; preached and held divine services in the ancient Slavonic tongue; and at the end of four and a half years were gratified to see their labors crowned with the most splendid success.[1] At the close of this time (A. D. 868), both these missionaries set out for Rome, to give an account of their labors. Cyril retired to a monastery, where he died; but Methodius, having been consecrated bishop by Pope *Hadrian II.*, with jurisdiction over Pannonia and Moravia, but without any fixed see, returned to continue his missionary labors among the Slavonians. He now set about and completed the work of translating the Scriptures into the Slavonic tongue. After Methodius had returned home, some of the priests of the archdiocese of Salzburg questioned the motives which led him to use the Slavonic language in the liturgy, and sought to throw suspicion upon his conduct; but he successfully defended his course of action at Rome (A. D. 879), and, besides obtaining permission from Pope John VIII. to continue the practice, was invested with plenary jurisdiction over all the clergy of Moravia.[2] Shortly after (A. D.

---

[1] Vita Constantini by a contemporary, in *Bolland.* mens. Mart., T. II., p. 19. *Presbyteri Diocleatis* (about 1161) regnum Slavor., c. 8 sq. (*Schwandtner*, Scriptor. rer. Hungaric., T. III., p. 474.) Conf. *Ginzel*, Hist. of Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavonians and of the Slavic Liturgy, Leitmeritz, 1857, with the literature incident to the subject, and an appendix, "*Glagolitic* (Moravian-Slavonic) *Fragments*." *Dr. Dudik*, O.S.B., General History of Moravia, Brünn, 1860, Vol. I. *Bily*, Hist. of the Apostles of the Slavonians, SS. Cyril and Methodius, Prague, 1863.

[2] Joannis VIII. ep. 195. ad Method. Archiepisc. Pannoniens., a. 879: Audivimus, quod non ea, quae St. Romana Ecclesia ab ipso Apostolorum principe didicit, et quotidie praedicat, tu docendo doceas, et ipsum populum in errorem mittas. Unde his Apostolatus Nostri literis tibi jubemus, ut omni occasione postposita, ad Nos de praesenti venire procures, ut ex ore tuo audiamus et cognoscamus, utrum sic teneas et sic praedices, sicut verbis et literis te St. Romanae Ecclesiae credere promisisti, aut non, ut veraciter cognoscamus doctrinam tuam. Audi-

881), he again set out to Rome to submit some controverted points to the judgment of the Apostolic See, after which his name disappears from history. He probably died about A. D. 885.

Owing to the ill feeling and mutual jealousies which the Moravians entertained for the Germans, with whom they had carried on many wars, *Moymar*, a Moravian prince, requested and obtained from Pope John IX. a grant, by which the church of Moravia was made independent of that of Germany, with an archbishop and two suffragan bishops. In the year 900, the archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg protested against this change. But, as the kingdom of Moravia ceased to exist in 908, when its territories were divided between Bohemia and Hungary, its ecclesiastical jurisdiction was, by order of Pope Agapetus II., restored (A. D. 952) to *Gerhard*, then Bishop of Passau, who appointed *Sylvester* first Bishop of Moravia.

In the year 973, and, after a short interruption, again in 981, Moravia was placed under the jurisdiction of the bish-

---

vimus etiam, quod missas cantes in barbara, h. e. in *slavina lingua*: unde jam literis Nostris per Paulum Episcopum Anconitanum tibi directis prohibuimus, ne in ea lingua sacra missarum solemnia celebrares; sed vel in latina, vel in graeca lingua, sicut Ecclesia Dei toto orbe terrarum diffusa et omnibus gentibus dilatata cantat. Praedicare vero aut sermonem in populo facere tibi licet, quoniam Psalmista (Ps. CXVI.) omnes admonet Dominum gentes laudare, et Apostolus: omnis, inquit, lingua confiteatur, quia Dominus Jesus in gloria est Dei Patris. (Phil. ii. 11; *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 133.) After coming to an agreement with Rome, the Pope wrote to Swatopluk (Conf. Joan. VIII. ep. 247, a. 880, ad Sfentopulcrum): Literas Slavonicas a Constantino quodam (?) philosopho repertas, quibus Deo laudes debite resonant, jure laudamus, et in eadem lingua Christi Domini nostri praeconia et opera, ut enarrentur, jubemus. Neque enim tribus tantum, sed omnibus linguis Dominum omnes gentes, etc. (Ps. cxvi.; Act. ii.; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Cor., c. xiv.) Nec sane fidei vel doctrinae aliquid obstat, sive missas in eadem slavonica lingua canere, sive sacrum evangelium, vel lectiones divinas N. et V. T. bene translatas et interpretatas legere, aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere; quoniam qui fecit tres linguas principales, hebraeam, graecam et latinam, ipse creavit et alias omnes ad laudem et gloriam suam. Jubemus tamen, ut in omnibus Ecclesiis terrae vestrae propter majorem honorificentiam evangelium latine legatur, et postmodum slavonica lingua translatum in auribus populi latina verba non intelligentis annuncietur: sicut in quibusdam ecclesiis fieri solet. (*Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 182.) Conf. Joan. VIII. ep. 194, in *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 132. See *Glagolitica* on the Origin of the Roman-Slavic Liturgy, 2d ed., Prague, 1832.

opric of Prague, to which it remained attached until the establishment of the bishopric of Olmütz, in 1062.

In 844, many of the Czechs, who, in the course of the sixth century, had passed from Croatia into *Bohemia*, embraced Christianity. They were baptized at Ratisbon (A. D. 845), whither they had gone for that purpose by order of the German king, Lewis. Subsequent efforts to propagate Christianity in Bohemia were prosecuted with comparatively small difficulty from the neighboring country of Moravia.[1]

In order to repel the attacks of the Germans, Borziwoi, Duke of Bohemia, entered into an alliance with Swatopluk, King of Moravia, and, while engaged in this transaction, obtained a knowledge of Christianity, which he at once embraced, he and his whole retinue receiving baptism at the hands of *Methodius*.[2] Here again Methodius, owing to his partiality for a Slavonic liturgy, fell under suspicion of heterodoxy, and accusation against him was sent to the Pope; but the only effect of such measure was a more complete understanding and a closer alliance between the Church of Bohemia and the Holy See.

Duke Borziwoi and his wife *Ludmilla*, the first of Bohemia's saints, acting under the prudent counsel of Methodius, labored most effectively, in the presence of innumerable difficulties, for the propagation of Christianity and the establishment of the Church throughout the length and breadth of their territories. The work which they had commenced was zealously taken up by their son, Duke *Spitignew*, who did not slacken his efforts till the day of his death, A. D. 915.

But, after the death of his brother, Wratislaus (A. D. 925), Drahomira, the widow of the latter, took sides with the malcontents; had Ludmilla, her mother-in-law, put to death; banished the clergy, and demolished the churches. Her own son, *Wenceslaus*, who had been taught by his grandmother, Ludmilla, to walk in the ways of virtue, continued faithful to Christianity.

---

[1] *Cosmas Prag.* (†1125), Chron. Bohemor. (Scriptt. rer. Bohem. Prag. 1784, T. I.) Vita St. Ludmillae et St. Wenceslai auct. Christiano de Scala Monacho. (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. Sept., T. V., p. 354; T. VII., p. 825.) *Gelasii* a St. Catharina (Dobner) Hajeki Annales Bohem. illustrati., Prag. 1761–1777, V. P. 4to. *Balbini* Miscellanea hist. bohem. and epitome hist. rer. bohemicar., Prag. 1677, fol. *Palacky*, Hist. of Bohemia, I. Pt. *Frind*, Church History of Bohemia, Prague, 1864–1866, 2 vols. *Zeleny*, de relig. christ. in Bohemia principiis, Prague, 1855. Conf. the articles "*Bohemia*" and "*Prague*," in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaedia.

[2] In the year 894, according to *Cosmas Prag.;* but according to *Dombrowsky*, between 870 and 880.

After the death of Wenceslaus, who was slain in 938 by his unnatural and Pagan brother, Boleslaus, Paganism enjoyed a temporary triumph, which was checked by Otho I., who compelled (A. D. 950) Boleslaus to restore the Christian Church in Bohemia. His son and successor (A. D. 967–999), Boleslaus II., surnamed the Pious, effected the complete triumph of the Christian Church. He had a bishopric established at Prague in 973. Pope John XIII confirmed the establishment of this bishopric, but only *on condition that the language of the liturgy should be*, not Slavonic, but *Latin*.[1] The new see was subject to the metropolitan of Mentz. Its first two bishops, *Ditmar*, a Saxon, and *Adalbert* (Woyciech), a Bohemian, who had been educated at Magdeburg, while endeavoring to make the manners of the people conform to Gospel purity, were obliged to contend against the strongest human passions and the most degraded of vices, such as polygamy, incestuous marriages, arbitrary divorces, and traffic in captives. But what was still worse, Adalbert had the misfortune of possessing a dissolute clergy. On two different occasions he quitted his diocese and returned to his monastery, where having remained for a season, he would again go forth in the hope of being able to correct the morals and subdue the refractory spirit of his clergy; but, finding all his efforts unavailing, he gave up the task in despair, bade a last farewell to his flock, and withdrew to Rome, whence he went as a missionary to distant countries, and was finally martyred in Prussia, A. D. 997.

---

[1] Joan. XIII. ep. ad Boleslaum, a. 967 (?): Unde apostolica auctoritate et St. Petri Principis Apostolor. potestate . . . annuimus et collaudamus atque incanonizamus, quod ad ecclesiam SS. Viti et Wenceslai Martyrum fiat sedes Episcopalis. . . . *Verumtamen non secundum ritus aut sectas Bulgariae gentis, vel Russiae, aut Slavonicae linguae; sed magis sequens instituta et decreta apostolica, unum potiorem totius ecclesiae ad placitum eligas in hoc opus Clericum, latinis litteris apprime eruditum.* (*Cosmae* Chronic. lib. in Dobneri ann. *Hajeki.*, T. IV., p. 194.)

In the year 1347, and while Charles IV. was emperor, Prague was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see.

The Slavic tribes of the *Wends* (the Serbs, between the Elbe and the Saal; the Leutizians or Wilzians, between the Elbe and the Oder; and the Obotrites, in Mecklenberg) carried on an unceasing conflict against the Germans, and stubbornly maintained their independence until the reign of Henry I. (A. D. 926.)[1] And when they were finally subjugated, the event proved a new obstacle to the introduction of Christianity among them; while, on the other hand, Otho I. regarded their conversion as essential to the security of Germany. "*He wished to prove, in this instance, as in the cases of Denmark and Bohemia, that he had not been invested with the title of Protector of the Universal Church of Christ to no purpose.*" With a view of carrying this idea into effect, he caused to be established among these subjugated tribes, the bishoprics of *Havelberg* (A. D. 946), *Brandenburg* (A. D. 949), and the still more important sees of *Meissen* (A. D. 955), *Merseburg*, *Zeitz* (transferred to Naumburg in the year 1029), and *Oldenburg*, established about the year 968, and transferred to Lübeck in 1164. All these bishoprics, with the exception of the last-mentioned, still later on, passed under the jurisdiction of the the Archbishop of *Magdeburg*, whose see had been established in the year 968, and richly endowed. But these sees, being generally, besides the residences of bishops, also political centers and the strongholds of foreign power, led the people to include Christianity in the detestation which they entertained for their conquerors. Hence, in the year 983, the Obotrites and Leutizians rose in insurrection, under the leadership of their prince, Mistewoi, renounced Christianity, and martyred its priests. Afterward, however, *Gottschalk*, who had been brought up a Christian at Lüneburg, united all the Wendish tribes into one powerful Slavic confederation, and labored with becoming zeal and earnestness to again introduce and establish Christianity among them. The bishoprics of *Mecklenburg* and *Ratzeburg* are among the evidences of his success. These sees, as well as that of Oldenburg, were made suffragan to the metropolitan see of Hamburg. In 1066, the inhabitants again rose in insurrection; murdered *Gottschalk* at Lentzen; martyred close upon sixty priests; demolished the churches; and even went so far as to offer *John*, Bishop of Mecklenburg, as a sacrifice upon the altar of the idol Radegast, at Rhetra. The persecution of the Christians which followed this popular outburst, extended as far as Hamburg and Slesvig. Still the good work went on. In the very year of the breaking out of this popular furý, *Benno*, Bishop of Meissen, began his labors among the Serbs, which he continued uninterruptedly for twenty years, and prosecuted with such heroic zeal and splendid success that he merited, and has been honored with, the title of Apostle of the Slavonians.[1] He died, A. D. 1100, in the ninety-sixth year of his age, after having endured and borne up under all manner of trials and persecutions heaped upon him by Henry IV. because of his attachment to Pope Gregory VII.

---

[1] *Masch*, Antiquities concerning the worship of the Obotrites, Berlin, 1771. *Gebhardt*, Hist. of all the Wendo-Slavic States, Halle, 1790, 2 vols. 4to.

§ 182. *Conversion of the Poles.*[2]

Lengnich, Diss. de religion. christ. in Polonia initiis, 1734, 4to. *Ejusdem* Jus publicum regni Polonic., T. II., ed. alt. Gedani, 1735–1766. Hence the Polish evision, Lengnicha Prawo pospolitae Krolestwa Polskiego, Krakow, 1836, Vol. III., c. 5, p. 225.

†*J. A. Zaluski*, Conspectus novae collectionis legum ecclesiasticar. Poloniae (Synodicon Poloniae orthodoxae), Varsow, 1774, 4to. *Lelewel*, Introduction of Christianity in Poland, by *Ossolinski*, Vincent. Kadlubek, German by *Linde*, Warsaw, 1822, p. 565–570. *Friese*, Ch. H. of the Kingdom of Poland, 2 Pts., Breslau, 1786. †*Ostrowski*, Dzieje i prawa kosciola polskiego, Warszawa, 1793,

---

[1] Conf. *Buttler*, Lives of the Saints, German by *Räss* and *Weiss*, Vol. VIII., p. 205–216. He was canonized, on the authority of early processes, by Pope *Hadrian VI.*, who hoped in this way to bring the Saxons back to the Church.

[2] The most celebrated Polish historians are: *Martini Galli* (about 1130), together with Vinc. Kadlubek, ed. Gedani, 1749; ed. Bandtkie, Varsow, 1824; ed. *Klimes*, ad cod. saec. XIII. Teplens., Prag. 1859. *Dlugosz* (*Longinus*, Canonic. Cracov. postea episc. Leopoliens. †1480, interesting and reliable as to what he has written on his own age, i. e. since 1413, but neither very critical nor very reliable as to former ages), Historia Poloniae ed. Huyssen, aux. Grodeckius, Frcf. 1711, II. T. f. *Cromert* Varmiens. episc. (†1589) Polonia, sive de origine et reb. gestis Polon., Basil. 1554. *Naruszewicz*, Historia narodu polskiego (until 1386), new ed., Lips. 1836; *Röpell*, Hist. of Poland, I. Pt., Hamb. 1840 (down to the fourteenth century).

3 T. **Röpell*, l. l., p. 95–104, especially Appendix IV., "Introduction of Christianity in Poland," p. 622–650.

It is related that the Gospel had been announced to the Poles by the disciples of Methodius. Nay, more; it is even asserted that *Ziemovit*, the great-grandfather of Duke Mieczyslaus, and his successors, if they did not positively favor, at least put no obstacles in the way of, the propagation of Christianity. But these assertions do not rest on the authority of any of the older historians. It is, however, tolerably well ascertained that, after the fall of the Moravian monarchy, such of the conquered people as fled into Poland carried with them thither the knowledge of Christianity. But it was not until after *Mieczyslaus* had recognized the right of suzerainty of the Emperor Otho I., that the Church in Poland grew in importance and became firmly and permanently established. We are told by *Ditmar*, Bishop of Merseburg, to whose writings we are indebted for the most ancient accounts of this people, that in the year 965 Duke Mieczyslaus espoused *Dombrowka*, the daughter of Boleslaus, Duke of Bohemia. Soon after their marriage, the Duke, at his wife's request, embraced Christianity, and was baptized[1] by a Bohemian priest named Bohuwid. He at once issued orders that, on a designated Sunday in the year 967, all the idols in the country should be broken into bits and the fragments cast into the rivers. This act was taken ill by the bulk of the people, whose memories were wound up with their ancient faith, and who, when they beheld their long-venerated idols destroyed, burst into loud cries and lamentations.[2]

Mieczyslaus established a bishopric at *Posen* in 968, which was made a suffragan of the metropolitan church of Madgeburg.[3] *Jordan*, the first Bishop of Posen, labored with a zeal truly apostolic for the conversion of the remainder of Poland.[1] *Boleslaus Chrobri*, or the Powerful (A. D. 992–1025), the son of Mieczyslaus, went to work, in a spirit of persevering earnestness and zeal, to establish the Church in Poland upon a still more solid basis. He invited the Camaldulese monks into the country,[2] and founded the Benedictine abbey of *Tyniec* (c. A. D. 1006). The Benedictine abbey on the *Bald Mountain* and the one at *Sieciechow* were probably founded by Boleslaus III., a hundred years later.[3] The holiness of the life of *Adalbert*, and, still more, the incidents of his heroic death (April 23, A. D. 997), among the barbarous and idolatrous Prussians, touched and subdued the hearts of the Poles, and won them over to the cause of truth. His tomb, at *Gnesen*, soon became a much-frequented pilgrimage, and his incomparable hymn in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been always treasured by the gallant Polanders as a rich legacy, and sung by them when dashing into battle.[4] It is said that the emperor Otho III., having formerly known Adalbert at Rome, and entertained a great reverence for him,

---

[1] *Bogufal*, near *Sommersberg*, Scriptt. Siles., relates: Qui (Meszko) tandem anno 965 Dombroviam sororem st. Venceslai duxit in uxorem; anno sequente cum tota gente Lechitarum seu polonica, *uxore suadente ac gratia divina inspirante*, sacrum baptisma suscepit, de qua uxore anno 967 filium generavit, cui nomen Boleslaus in sacro baptismate imponi fecit; anno vero 968 *Jordanum* in episcopum Poloniae ordinavit.

[2] Conf. *Jac. Grimm*, German Mythology, p. 446 sq.

[3] Ancient legends relate, and even historians, such as *Dlugosz*, *Cromer*, and

---

others affirm, that *Mieczyslaus*, immediately after his baptism, established the metropolitan sees of Gnesen and Cracow, besides seven other bishoprics—viz., Posen, Smograu (Breslau), Kruszwick (Leslau), Plock, Kulm, Lebus, and Kaminiec—and erected many churches and convents, and all with the knowledge and consent of Pope John XIII. This Pope is represented as having sent Cardinal Aegidius (Giles) (Bishop of Tusculum), into Poland during the lifetime of Duke Mieczyslaus, to organize the dioceses of that country. But there is evidently a mistake here, and reference is probably made to a Cardinal Aegidius who was sent into Poland to look after the affairs of the Church, in the year 1123, during the reign of Boleslaus III. (Krzywousty.)

[1] *Ditmar* relates: Jordanus, primus eorum antistes, multum cum iis sudavit, dum eos ad supernae cultum vineae sedulus verbo et opere mutavit. Ed. *Wagner*, p. 97.

[2] Related by *Peter Damian*, in the vita St. Romualdi, c. 28. (Opp. Sti. P. Damiani, ed. *Cajetani*, Bassani, 1783, T. II., p. 453. *Bolland.* Acta SS. ad diem 7. mensis Februarii.)

[3] *Sczygielski*, Aquila Polono-Benedictina, Cracov. 1663, 4to.

[4] Tradition traces this magnificent hymn in honor of Mary, *Boga rodzicza*, back to St. Adalbert. Conf. *Wiszniewski*, Historya literat polskiej., Krak., T. I., p. 374–386. The biographies of *St. Adalbert* (*Canisii* lectt. antiq., T. III., Pt. I., p. 41 sq.) and other traditions, carefully collected by *Voigt*, Hist. of Prussia, Vol. I., Appendix III. *Tornwaldt*, The Life of St. Adalbert of Prague, Apostle of the Prussians (*Illgen*, Hist. Periodical, 1853, p. 167 sq.)

went on a pilgrimage to his tomb, and, while there, made arrangements with Boleslaus to have *Gnesen* raised to the dignity of an archbishopric, with the sees of *Colberg*, in Pomerania, *Cracow*, in Lesser Poland, and *Breslau*, in Silesia,[1] under its jurisdiction. Some time during the reign of *Mieczyslaus II.*, the bishoprics of Plock, for the Masovians[2] and Kruszwice (?) (probably Wroclawek), for the Cuiavians,[3] were, if not newly established, at least reorganized. During the anarchy which prevailed between the years 1034 and 1042, the Church of Poland was in imminent danger of going to destruction—a danger which was still further increased by the tyranny of the nobles and the dissoluteness of the clergy. It was fortunate for Poland that, at this time, a man distinguished alike by his virtues and his ability, was called to the throne. This was *Casimir I.* (A. D. 1043–1058)—a name that will be always held in veneration by the Poles. He averted, by prudence and firmness, those disasters by which his country was threatened; restored the Benedictine abbey of Tyniec, near Cracow; and, as is supposed, founded that of *Leubus*, in Silesia. By thus founding houses which, by their very character, were nurseries of the Christian clergy, he secured the permanency of the Christian Church in Poland.[4]

It is true, as Pope Gregory VII. complained, the Church of this country was not consolidated by the centralizing bonds of a metropolitan see;[5] but, for all that, it was so powerful, and its authority so universally respected, that even the King could not outrage its rights with impunity. For when, in 1075, *Boleslaus II.* slew *St. Stanislaus*, Bishop *of Cracow*, at the foot of the altar, for having reprimanded him for conduct unbecoming a prince, he was obliged to take flight to escape the indignation and fury of his subjects. He was excommunicated by the Pope, and died a miserable death (c. A. D. 1081).

---

[1] *Grünhagen* and *Korn*, Regesta episcopatus Vratislaviensis. Extracts from documents, Breslau, 1864, Pt. I., until the year 1302. *Herber*, Silesiae sacrae origines. Adnexae sunt tabulae chronolog. in annal. hist. dioec. Vratislav. 1821. *Ritter*, Hist. of the diocese of Breslau, Pt. I., Brsl. 1845 (to 1290). †*Heyne*, Authenticated Hist. of the bishopric and chapter of the Cathedral of Breslau, ibid. 1860, Vol. I.

[2] On the several bishoprics just mentioned, conf. *Rzepnicki*, S.J., Vitae Praesulum Polon. libris 4 comprehensae. Posnaniae, 1761.

[3] It has been shown by canon *Frank* of Posen, in the *Jabczynski* Gazeta Koscielna, year 1833, n. 44, that most probably there did not exist any episcopal see at *Kruszwice.*

[4] *Naruszewicz*, l. c., T. IV., p. 193–210, and *Röpell*, Vol. I., p. 180, have clearly shown that Casimir never was a monk, either at Clugny or at Brauweiler, and consequently stood in no need of any papal dispensation to take upon himself the government of Poland. *Billuart*, *Darras*, etc., are to be amended accordingly. (Tr.)

[5] *Gregory VII.* ep. 73. ad Boleslaum Polonor. ducem., a. 1075, complains: Quod

§ 183. *Christianity in Hungary.*

J. Thwrocz, Chronica Hungar. (*Schwandtner*, Script. rer. Hungaric., Vindobonae, 1746, fol.) *Inchofer*, S.J., Annal. eccl. regni, Hung. 1644. *Pray*, Annal. vet. Hunnor., Avaror. et Hungaror., Vindobonae, 1761, fol. *Fejer*, Codex diplomaticus Hungar. eccl. et civil., Budae, 1828, T. I. *Mailáth*, Hist. of the Magyars, Vienna, 1828, Vol. I. Conf. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. 33, p. 412–439.

The migration of the Magyars (Hungarians) into ancient Pannonia dates from the close of the ninth century. Though their origin has given rise to many doubts, it is now established that they belong to the *Finnish* race. Their dualistic religion and the name of their evil genius, which they called *Armanyos* (Ahriman), go to show that they are of Persian descent. They offered sacrifices on the mountain-tops, in groves, and by the side of fountains. *White horses* were believed to be the most acceptable victims. The first knowledge of Christianity which this people received came to them from Constantinople, about the year 950. *Bolosudes* and *Gylas*, two Hungarian chiefs, having been baptized at Constantinople, returned to their native country in company with a monk named *Hierotheus*, who had been consecrated Bishop of Hungary.[1] His efforts to bring the people into the fold of Christ were shortly crowned with unlooked-for success. Duke *Geisa* (A. D. 972–997), who had married *Sarolta*, the daughter

---

Episcopi terrae vestrae non habentes certum Metropolitanae sedis locum, nec sub aliquo positi magisterio huc et illuc pro sua quisque ordinatione vagantes, ultra regulas et decreta SS. Patrum liberi sunt et absoluti; deinde vero, quod inter tantam hominum multitudinem adeo pauci sunt Episcopi et amplae singulorum parochiae, ut in subjectis plebibus curam episcopalis officii nullatenus exsequi aut rite administrare valeant. (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1318. *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 183.)

[1] Conf. *Schröckh*, Christian Ch. Hist., P. 21, p. 225 sq.

of Gylas, a lady very devoted to the faith and equally active in extending the knowledge of it among others, was, by her efforts, brought to profess Christianity and receive baptism. The Church of Hungary was brought into close union with the Church of the West by means of the labors of numerous missionaries, by the relations which existed between Geisa and the Emperor Otho III., and by the influence of the Christians who had been led into captivity from western countries, and who almost equaled in number those who retained them in bondage.

Above five hundred Hungarians were baptized (A. D. 974) by missionaries who had been sent into the country by *Piligrim*, Bishop of Passau, and *Adalbert*, Bishop of Prague. But it is somewhat strange that, notwithstanding their conversion, both they and Geisa continued, for some time longer, to offer sacrifices to their gods.

Geisa's son *Stephen* (A. D. 997–1038) possessed more character and resolution, and a stronger and more enlightened faith. He was brave, upright, and magnanimous; an enlightened legislator, a benefactor of his native land, and one of the most noble and distinguished characters of the Middle Ages—a prince whose exalted virtues have entitled him to rank with Alfred of England and Louis IX. of France, and raised him to the dignity of a saint. By his marriage with Gisela, the sister of Henry II., he became still more closely connected with Germany, whose civilization he introduced in his own country. His first care was to secure the permanency of the Church.[1] To this end, he founded *four Benedictine abbeys;* established the archbishopric of *Gran* and ten suffragan bishoprics, viz., *Veszprim*, *Fünfkirchen*, *Raab* (*Bacs*, *Colocza*, *Erlau*, *Waitzen*, *Csanad*, *Grosswardein*, and *Weissenburg ?*). He also endeavored to cultivate among his subjects a love for pilgrimages, and thereby keep up a communication between them and other Christian nations. He erected and endowed hospitals and cloisters for their use and convenience, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, Rome, and Ravenna. These pious works were applauded by the Emperor Otho III. and Pope *Sylvester II.*—the latter of whom, it is said, sent Stephen a *crown* and *cross of gold*, as symbols of royal authority, and conferred upon him the title of *Apostolic King*, a term intended to express his great influence in ecclesiastical affairs.[1] Unfortunately, his son *St. Emmeric* died while still young, A. D. 1032. His nephew, *Peter*, was deposed on account of his debaucheries, and the insurgents, who were all unbelievers, called to the throne from Russia, *Andrew*, one of the race of the Arpád (A. D. 1045). This prince consented to the restoration of Pagan worship, the last vestiges of which were forcibly and completely destroyed by his successor, Béla, who began to reign A. D. 1060.

---

[1] *Charvitius* (a Bp. of Hungary), vita St. Stephani. (*Schwandtner*, l. c., p. 414 sq. *Bolland.* Acta SS. d. 2. m. Sept.)

---

[1] Conf. de sacrae coronae regni Hungariae ultra 700 annos clarissimae virtute, victoria, fortuna commentarius. (*Schwandtner*, T. II., p. 416 sq. Conf. p. 602–837.) *A. Horanyi* (a Hungarian Piarist), Commentar. de sacra corona Hungariae ac de regibus eadem redimitis, Pesth, 1790. *Palma*, Prael. h. e., Vol. II., p. 120 sq. (Tr.)

CHAPTER II.

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE.

I. *Anastasii Bibliothecarii* (about 870) Lib. pontificalis, seu Vitae Romanor. Pontificum a Petro Apostolo usque ad Nicol. I. [from Constantine (708) full, and, as a rule, supported by documents,] ed. *Blanchini*, Romae, 1718–1735, 4 T. fol.; emend. *J. Vignolius*, Romae, 1724–1753, 3 T. 4to. (*Muratori*, Rer. Ital. scriptor., T. III., Pt. I.) *Flodoardi* (†966) Lib. de Roman. Pontificib. (715–935) in *Muratori*, Scriptor., etc., T. III., Pt. II., and *Mabillon*, Annal. ord. S. Benedict. saec. III. Vitae Romanor. Pontificum exeunte saeculo IX. ad finem saec. XIII. ed. * *Watterich*, Lips. 1862, 2 T. The histories and chronicles of *Luitprand*, *Hermannus Contractus*, *Ditmar of Merseburg*, *Glaber Radulphus*, *Landulphus* (senior and junior), *Martinus Polonus*, and others.

II. *Baronii* Annales; *Muratori*, Annali d'Italia (Germ. transl., Lps. 1745 sq., 9 vols. 4to.) *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the city of Rome in the Middle Ages, Vols. III. and IV. *Von Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II., p. 188–365. *Hock*, Gerbert; *Höfler*, German Popes; *Weiss*, Alfred the Great.

§ 184. *Summary.*

The history of the three centuries, upon which we are about to enter, proves, beyond all manner of doubt, the paramount importance of the *Holy Alliance concluded between Pope Leo III. and the Emperor Charlemagne.* It is impossible not to recognize in this instrument, by which the Pope was invested with plenary religious and ecclesiastical authority, and the Emperor with plenary civil and political power, the hand of God directing all things, in both the spiritual and temporal orders, in such way, that *the two worked harmoniously* and in perfect accord *for the religious and social improvement* and temporal advancement *of the nations* of Europe.

And it is a fact worthy of observation, that, as long as the two powers continued to work together energetically, each in its own sphere, without serious jar or misunderstanding, the two mutually came to the aid of each other, and Church and State respectively went steadily on to a more perfect development. But no sooner had the power and consideration formerly enjoyed by the Emperor begun to wane, than the well-defined and established principles which had hitherto regulated the intercourse of the nations of Europe were disregarded, and violent disorders ensued. In like manner, when the despotic princes of Italy had hampered and paralyzed the authority and influence of the Head of the Church, ecclesiastical life decayed in nearly every country of Europe.

Hence, during the close of the ninth century and the early half of the tenth—i. e. during the period when the Holy Alliance between the Pope and the Emperor was broken off—the condition of both Church and State was most deplorable. And again, during the latter half of the tenth and throughout the whole of the eleventh century, or after the alliance between the two powers had been renewed, Church and State once more prospered and flourished, and the life-giving principle, going forth from a common center, imparted vigor and strength, and insured harmonious action, to the members of the body, social and ecclesiastical.

A.—THE POPES UNDER THE CARLOVINGIANS (814-899).

(PERMISSION GIVEN TO THE EMPEROR, OR HIS REPRESENTATIVES, TO BE PRESENT AT THE CORONATION OF THE POPES.)

Capitularia regum Francorum, in *Baluz.* l. c.; in *Pertz*, Monument. Germ., T. II., and in *Mansi*, Collectio concilior., as Appendices to T. XII.-XVIII. Conf. *Phillips*, Hist. of Germ., T. II., p. 88-172. *Gfrörer*, Hist. of the Carlovingians, Freiburg, 1848, 2 pts. *Dümmler*, Hist. of the East-Frankish Empire, Berlin, 1862, Vol. I.

§ 185. *Under Louis the Mild and his Sons.*

Charlemagne, while still full of hope that the most gifted and promising of his children might be blessed with length of days, had laid upon them the solemn obligation of faithfully and inviolably executing the conditions of the alliance into which he had entered with Pope Leo III.[1] The grand design of Charlemagne, of becoming protector of the Church, was warmly taken up, and on various occasions carried into practical effect, by *Louis the Pious*, or the *Mild* (*le Débonnaire*), the only one of his sons who survived him.[2] Owing to the mature judgment of this prince, and the kindly feeling which he was known to entertain toward the Church, it was hoped he would early set himself to the work of correcting the many and serious abuses that had crept in during the reign of his father. This hope was still further strengthened by his subsequent conduct. He sent the *Missi Dominici*, or Imperial Messengers, into every part of his kingdom to receive the grievances of the people; caused a number of councils to insist on the observance of the canons relative to the morals of the clergy and the community-life of ecclesiastics; took measures to secure his frontiers against the incursions of the Slaves, and reduced the Duke of Benevento to subjection.

---

[1] The original document makes the Emperor say: "Non ut confuse atque inordinate, aut sub totius regni dominatione, jurgii controversiam eis relinquamus, sed trina partitione *totum regni corpus* dividentes—super omnia autem jubemus atque praecipimus, ut ipsi tres fratres *curam et defensionem Ecclesiae sancti Petri* simul suscipiant, sicut quondam ab avo nostro Carolo et beatae memoriae genitore nostro Pippino rege et a nobis postea suscepta est."

[2] Sed quoniam complacuit divinae providentiae, nostram mediocritatem ad hoc constituere, ut sanctae suae Ecclesiae et regni hujus curam gereremus, ad hoc certare et nos et filios ac socios nostros diebus vitae nostrae optamus, ut tria specialiter capitula et a nobis et a vobis, Deo opem ferente, in hujus regni administratione specialiter conserventur; id est, ut *defensio et exaltatio vel honor sanctae Dei Ecclesiae* et servorum illius congruus maneat, et pax et justitia in omni generalitate populi nostri conservetur. Capitulare Lud. Pii a. 823, c. 2. (Capitularia reg. Francor. ed. *Baluz.*, T. I., p. 429.)

Stephen V. (IV.?), who succeeded to the papal throne (June, 816) upon the death of Leo III., in accordance with the conditions ot the alliance entered into with Charlemagne by his predecessor, made the Romans take an oath of fealty to Louis. He then set out for France, for the purpose of crowning the Emperor. He was received with every mark of distinction and honor; and even the Emperor, on approaching him, prostrated himself three times. Louis was crowned by the Pope, at *Rheims*, notwithstanding that he had been previously (A. D. 813) designated as Emperor by his father, and, in an assembly at Aix-la-Chapelle had placed the crown upon his own head.

It is said that Pope Stephen, in the year of his election, assembled a synod at *Rome*, in which he published a decretal, ordaining that in future the popes should be elected by the (cardinal) bishops and the Roman clergy, in presence of the Roman Senate and people; but that their consecration should take place in presence of the imperial embassadors (*praesentibus legatis imperialibus*).[1] The high hopes which had been entertained of Louis, during the early days of his reign, were soon blighted. It was not long before it became abundantly evident that he was little more than the pliant instrument of his court favorites, and particularly of his second wife, *Judith* (after the year 818). Like his father, he divided his kingdom among the three sons, born of Irmengard, his first wife. *Pepin* was made King of Aquitaine; *Louis*, the youngest, was created Duke of Bavaria and lord of the Avaric and Slavic provinces; and *Lothaire*, who shared with his father the government of the empire (A. D. 817), was declared King of Italy (A. D. 821) upon the death of his cousin, *Bernard.* The last-named prince, dissatisfied with the portion which had fallen to his lot, violated his solemn engagements and appealed to arms; and, having been defeated and taken prisoner, had his eyes plucked out, and died of the torments which he was made to suffer.

---

[1] *Muratori* and several other modern historians, against Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Pagi, and others, claimed for Pope Stephen V. this decretal, which appears also in the Corpus Jur. can., c. 28, Dist. 63. Its adversaries either deemed it to be spurious, or attributed it to Pope Stephen VI. (VII.) Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. IV., p. 7.

But Judith was sufficiently cunning and far-seeing to so change or modify this order of succession as to consult for the best interests of her son, *Charles*, who had been born June 13, A. D. 823; and to this end she prevailed upon the Emperor to set apart for the young prince the provinces of Suabia, Alsace, and a portion of Burgundy. This new arrangement was so displeasing to the sons of Louis by his first wife, that they placed themselves at the head of a party of malcontents, drew the sword against their father, and demanded that he should resign the crown, that his queen should enter a convent, and her brothers take holy orders. Their efforts, however, were unavailing, and Lothaire, who aspired to be sole ruler of the empire, was obliged to submit to the superiority of his father, who, with the powerful aid of the East-Frankish and Saxon nobility, triumphed over all his enemies.

But, though Louis was weak and vacillating in the government of his empire, there was no lack of stubborn energy when there was question of maintaining his rights against the Head of the Church. Hence he entered his protest against the right of *Pascal I.* (A. D. 817–824) to ascend the papal throne, because he had been elected and consecrated before the arrival of the imperial embassadors, whose presence was required, according to the articles of agreement entered into between the Pope and the Emperor during the lifetime of Charlemagne. The Pope pleaded, in excuse, that personal violence had been offered to himself, and that, to meet the growing disorders of the factions within the city of

Rome, there was need of prompt and energetic action. The Emperor, satisfied with this explanation, confirmed and somewhat enlarged the grants that had been made by his father and grandfather to the Holy See,[1] and the Pope, in turn, crowned Lothaire, who had been again associated with his father in the government of the Empire (A. D. 823).

Pope Pascal took advantage of the season of peace that followed, to erect new and restore old churches and convents, into which the monks who had been driven from the East by the fury of the Iconoclasts were received and provided for. The Pope would have been glad to do more for those oppressed people, but his means were not commensurate with his will. He also cheerfully seconded the missionary labors undertaken among the Danes by *Ebbo*, Archbishop of Rheims.

Lothaire made a second journey to Rome, whither he was sent by his father to put an end to the disgraceful scenes that were daily enacted by the factious partisans of the various aspirants to the papacy. *Eugene II.* (A. D. 824–827) was successful over all his competitors. In order the better to insure the obedience of the Roman nobility and people, Eugene and Lothaire entered into the following arrangement: The Pope, on his part, published an edict, requiring the Roman clergy and people to take an oath of fealty to the Emperor, which ran as follows: "I promise, in the name of the Almighty God, by the holy Gospels, by the holy Rood, and by the body of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, that I shall be ever faithful to our lords the Emperors Louis and Lothaire; *excepting, always, whatever may interfere with the loyalty I have pledged to the Sovereign Pontiff.* Moreover, I shall never consent that a papal election be carried on in a way contrary to canonical rule or the prescriptions of justice; *neither* shall I consent that the Pope-elect be consecrated *before* having taken an oath similar to that taken by Eugenius, for the common weal of all, in the presence of the people and the imperial embassadors."

---

[1] *Paschalis* vita, epistolae et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 539 sq. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1223 sq. The Constitutio of Louis the Mild, in *Mansi*, l. c., p. 381 sq. *Harduin*, l. c., p. 1236 sq. The Papal possessions were now classified in the following manner: 1. Ex jure antiquo; 2. Ex donatione Pipini et Caroli M. donatione; 3. Ex pacto Carisiacensi (Çhiersy) et jure Carolo regi probato; 4. To which, afterward, Louis the Mild still added, "curtem regalem," in Germany Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. III., pp. 541, 542.

The object of this edict was to prove that it was the Pope's desire *to show to the Emperor the honor due to him as protector* of the Church.[1]

The Emperor, on his part, published a *constitution*,[2] consisting of nine articles, in which the mutual relations of the imperial to the papal power in Rome were clearly marked out and accurately defined. By this instrument it was ordained that no one should punish with death such persons as enjoyed the special protection of either the Pope or the Emperor; that all should render obedience to the Pope, and to the dukes and judges of his appointment; that a commissioner appointed conjointly by the Pope and the Emperor, should inquire into the administration of justice and the observance of the constitution, and report to the Emperor; that all complaints against dukes and judges should be submitted to the Pope, who might either return an immediate answer to them, by his nuncios, or refer them to the Emperor; that all property unjustly taken from the Apostolic See should be restored; and that all dukes and judges should repair to

---

[1] *Eugenii* vita et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 411 sq. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 125 sq. Cf. *Baluz.* capitul., T. I., p. 435 sq.

[2] The Constitutio Hlotharii imperator. in *Mansi*, l. c., p. 479. *Harduin*, p. 1261. We extract from it what follows: Constituimus ut omnes, qui sub speciali defensione domni Apostolici seu nostra fuerint suscepti, impetrata inviolabiter utantur defensione. Quod si quis in quocumque violare praesumpserit, sciat se periculum vitae suae incursurum. — In *electione autem Romani Pontificis* nullus sive liber, sive servus praesumat aliquod impedimentum facere. Sed illi solummodo Romani, quibus antiquitus concessum est constitutione SS. Patrum, sibi eligant Pontificem. Quod si quis contra hanc nostram constitutionem facere praesumpserit, exilio tradatur. — Volumus etiam, ut Missi constituantur a domno Apostolico et a nobis: qui annuatim nobis renuntient, qualiter singuli duces et judices justitiam populo faciant, et quomodo nostra constitutio servetur. — De rebus autem ecclesiarum injuste retentis sub occasione quasi licentia accepta a Pontifice, volumus, ut a legatis nostris in potestatem Pontificis et Romanae ecclesiae celerius redigantur. — Novissime praecipimus et monemus, ut omnis homo, sicut Dei gratiam et nostram habere desiderat, ita praestet in omnibus obedientiam atque reverentiam Romano Pontifici.

Rome, to give the Pope an opportunity to learn their names and number, and to instruct them on the various duties of their offices. Finally, the duty of obeying the Pope was made obligatory upon all persons.

From the above it will be seen that while the Emperor, as protector of the Roman Church, enjoyed, in some sort, a limited jurisdiction, the Pope was practically sovereign of Rome and the Roman State. And, in matter of fact, the Pope could not have got on amid the conflicts of factions, or escaped falling a victim to the machinations of some one of the contending parties within the city, unless he had been sustained by the authority and protection of the Emperor.[1]

After the iconoclastic heresy had broken out afresh in the East, during the reign of Michael the Stammerer, this Emperor made an effort to gain over Louis to his side. The latter, having obtained the consent of Pope Eugene, assembled a *synod at Paris*, A. D. 825, whose judgment was, for well-known reasons, unfavorable to the mission of the Greek embassy. Louis, after having removed from the acts of this synod whatever seemed offensive or objectionable, had a copy of them made and sent to the Pope. It still remains to be stated, before closing this pontificate, that, during it, the archbishopric of *Lorch*, which had been destroyed by the migratory tribes, was restored.

The conditions agreed to, in the compact between Lothaire and Eugene, were carried out at the elections of the popes *Valentine* and *Gregory IV.*—the former of whom reigned only forty days, and the latter from the year 827 to 844.[2] Neither of them was consecrated until after the imperial embassadors had arrived. *Ansgar*, the apostle of the Swedes and Norwegians, came to Rome during the pontificate of Gregory, and the latter conferred upon him the pallium, and created him Legate Apostolic of all the Northern nations. It was also during the pontificate of Gregory that the sons of Louis the Mild rose in arms against their father. They were apprehensive that Judith, coming forth from the cloister of the convent, would again set on foot fresh intrigues for the overthrow of the sons of Louis by his first wife, and the aggrandisement of her own son, Charles. It was now that Gregory, feeling that he was called upon, by his direct relations to the Emperor and his duty to the whole Christian world, *to act a decisive and energetic part*, hastily quit Italy, in the hope of preventing so unnatural a conflict. His character of mediator and his presence in the camp of the three brothers placed him in a position which filled him with anxiety and a sense of danger. Moreover, Lothaire, who well knew that the presence of the Pope would lend a sanction to his criminal designs in the eyes of those who were enlisted under his father's standard, forcibly and perfidiously retained Gregory in his camp. In this way the Holy Father was made the abettor of the infamous treason of the sons of Louis, caused the latter to be abandoned by his troops, and was, though unwillingly, instrumental in making him the prisoner of his unnatural children. The scene of this action was the plain of Rothfeld (Redfield), between Strasburg and Basle, and has ever since been called, by a sort of spontaneous and popular instinct, "the Faithless Field."

---

[1] Vide *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 121 sq., *Cox's* trans. (Tr.)

[2] *Gregorii IV.* vita, epistolae et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 503 sq. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1269 sq.

The Pope, indignant at this disgraceful act of treachery, and deeply grieved that so great a misfortune should have befallen Louis, set out at once for Italy. But the Emperor, though thus humbled and dishonored, had not yet experienced to the full the bitterness of his humiliation. He was arraigned, in October of this same year (A. D. 833), before an assembly of bishops and nobles at Compiègne, presided over by *Ebbo*, Archbishop of Rheims, and there, prostrate upon sackcloth, read aloud a confession, by which he acknowledged himself guilty of homicide, sacrilege, tyranny, and misgovernment. And, as if this act were still insufficient to complete his disgrace, the unfortunate Emperor, with tears in his eyes, himself performed the ceremony of degradation upon his own person, while the bishops, as is usual on such occasions, imposed hands and enjoined the penitential prayers. The three sons, now feeling themselves secure, made no secret of the satisfaction with which they regarded the disgrace of their afflicted father, whose only offense was that his paternal authority had been intolerable to his unnatural children. But the bulk of the people were far from sharing their sentiments. That a sovereign who had been uniformly kind and considerate, and whose goodness of heart had made him universally respected, should be thus humbled and dishonored by those who owed him but love and reverence, was shocking to every noble impulse and manly instinct, and popular indignation was soon turned against the perpetrators of the foul deed. The punishment of Lothaire was hastened by his arrogant bearing toward his two brothers. The generous-hearted Louis the Younger, keenly alive to the disgrace that had been put upon his father, made an appeal to arms, in which he was shortly joined by his brother Pepin. Lothaire, hearing of this hostile movement, taking his father with him, hastily quitted Aix-la-Chapelle, but being closely pressed, he released the Emperor at St. Denys and at once withdrew to his kingdom of Italy. No sooner had the lords, bishops, and military officers felt themselves safe from the anger and resentment of Lothaire than they hastened in a body to St. Denys, threw themselves at the feet of Louis and begged him to again take upon him the office and insignia of Emperor. Louis and Pepin humbly sought and obtained their father's forgiveness; and even Lothaire, now forsaken and despised, came craving pardon for his treachery and impiety. The conduct of the Emperor Louis was in keeping with the surname which he bore. He forgave all those who had betrayed him, and, as far as possible, forgot the outrages they had put upon him.

Forty-seven bishops, assembled at Thionville (A. D. 835) declared the acts of the Synod of Compiègne null and void; received the resignation of Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, which was submitted to the Pope and accepted; released Louis from the penance which had been laid upon him, and solemnly restored him to the imperial dignity.[1]

It should seem that so bitter an experience would have taught Louis important lessons as to his future conduct; but such was not the case—it was entirely lost upon the weak-minded Emperor. The Empire was threatened by the *Normans* and *Arabians* from without, while the people were groaning under the oppression of the imperial commissioners, whose duty it was to protect them against the arbitrary exactions of the counts. But neither external dangers nor internal abuses seemed to have any claim upon the time and consideration of Louis, who was wholly engaged in schemes to gratify the ambition of his wife, Judith, by promoting the interests of her youngest son, Charles. Not content with the considerable portion he had already marked out as the inheritance of the young prince, including a great part of Austrasia and Neustria, situated between the Meuse and the Seine, several counties of Burgundy, lying beyond the Jura, and the country between the Seine and the Loire, he proposed, after the death of Pepin, to divide his kingdom of Aquitaine, between Charles and Lothaire, the latter of whom had been gained over to the project by the insinuating address of Judith.

---

[1] Vide *Darras*, Gen'l Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 452 sq., Eng. transl. (Tr.)

Louis of Bavaria, to whom the Emperor owed his deliverance from his enemies, was naturally indignant at these arrangements, and once more drew the sword against his father. But the two armies had scarcely come up with each other when the aged Emperor was taken suddenly ill, and died on an island in the Rhine (A. D. 840).

It was but the dread of the Frankish name, with which Charlemagne had inspired foreign nations, that kept them in check during the troubled reign of Louis the Mild.

The quarrels within the imperial family were a source of *much sorrow and disquietude to the Church.* The well-established power of the Empire within its own territorial limits, and its authority abroad, had enabled the Church to lay the foundations of the social fabric, and to undertake, conjointly with the civil power, the education of so many nations still groping in barbarism. But this great work was now to be given up—at least for a time and in part. When the Church beheld the unnatural sight of sons contending in battle against their august father, and then, again, armed and struggling with equal fury against each other, she wisely concluded that she, too, should prepare to meet, if she could not avert, the storms which threatened her.

Lothaire wished to govern, with the title of Emperor, all those countries that had been formerly included in the empire of Charlemagne, and, the better to carry out his design, entered into an alliance with his nephew, Pepin of Aquitaine. Louis and Charles leagued together to resist this pretension. In the battle of *Fontenay* (Fontenaille), in Burgundy (A. D. 841), forty thousand men fell victims to the fury of this fratricidal strife. In vain did holy bishops interpose their authority and volunteer their kind offices to put a stop to it. Lothaire was implacable. He even went so far as to incite to rebellion the Saxon subjects of Louis. But he was finally compelled to forsake his ambitious designs, come to terms with his brothers, and sign the articles of the famous *Treaty of Verdun* (Virten), A. D. 843. This treaty stipulated that the Empire should be divided among Lothaire, Louis, and Charles the Bald. The last mentioned was also to exercise a suzerainty over the kingdom of Aquitaine, which was given to young Pepin. The peace was not of long duration. These fratricidal wars brought with them their curse, and it lay heavily upon each of the three brothers. Each regarded the other with suspicion and distrust, and they were all equally ready to seize every opportunity to embarrass and overreach each other. Now was the time for the aggressions of foreign enemies, and they were not slow to appreciate the occasion. The *Normans*, or Northmen, a nation of pirates and the allies of the Bretons, made descents upon the western coast of France, and devastated the kingdoms of Charles the Bald and Lothaire. Gliding in their light boats up the Seine and the Loire, the Garonne and the Rhone, they sacked the cities of Rouen, Paris, and many others, laid the country waste round about, and met and overthrew the royal armies. These daring seamen and bold marauders, skirting along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, entered the bays and rivers of Italy, demolished her cities, and overran her fair fields. But, bold as the Northmen were, they were not equal in reckless audacity to the pirates *of Arabia*. These adventurers, starting at Barcelona, laid waste the entire Spanish frontier and the adjacent countries, then returned and carried the terror of their name to the Sicilian shores, and, advancing to the north, made the Pope tremble for his safety within the walls of Rome.

The depredations of the Northmen within the kingdom of Louis the German were comparatively light. They did, indeed, advance up the Elbe with six hundred boats, and burn the city of Hamburg, but they were soon beaten back by the Germans, and compelled to give up the hope of any further conquest. But, if Louis suffered less from the Northmen than his two brothers, he was amply compensated for any such exemption by the inroads of the Slavic tribes. This prince, throughout the whole period of his reign, was constantly engaged in repelling the *Bohemians*, *Moravians*, *Serbs*, and *Obotrites* from his eastern frontier. Even his own children rose up against him; and thus the empire of Charlemagne fell to pieces before the dissolution with which it was threatened by the second migration of nations could overtake it.

As is usual with such princes, neither dissensions from within nor wars from without prevented Lothaire from guarding, with the most suspicious jealousy, his rights and position with regard to the Head of the Church.

Thus, for example, he sent his son Louis to Rome, at the head of an undisciplined army of marauders, to demand satisfaction, because, upon the death of Gregory IV., *Sergius II.* (A. D. 844–847) had been hastily elected and *consecrated* before the arrival of the imperial embassadors; notwithstanding that this had been done to prevent any violent measures on the part of the deacon John, who meditated a usurpation of the papal throne. But the Pope was equal to the emergency, and firmly refused to open the doors of the Vatican Basilica to Louis until after he had given his solemn assurance that he had no hostile design upon the Holy See. The Pope then crowned him King of the Lombards.

The *Scala Santa*, or Sacred Stairway, near the Lateran Basilica, consisting of the eighteen marble steps upon which our Savior mounted to the Court of Pontius Pilate, and which were sent to Rome by order of the empress Helena, was also built by Pope Sergius. Toward the close of this pontificate, the Saracens made a descent upon Italy, and, ascending the Tiber, pulled up before the very walls of Rome, disembarked, spread themselves over the adjacent country, pillaged its fields, and even plundered the basilicas of SS. Peter and Paul, without the walls.[1] Owing to this condition of affairs, it was impossible, upon the death of Sergius, to defer the election of his successor, *Leo IV.* (A. D. 847–855),[2] until the imperial embassadors should have arrived, and it was therefore at once proceeded with; but, in order to prevent any future complication, it was expressly declared that, in so doing, there was no intention of "*violating the fealty which the Pope owes, next after God, to the Emperor.*"

The new quarter of Rome which Leo built upon the Vatican hill, and which, together with the Church of St. Peter, was surrounded with a wall, and has since been called the Leonine City, was at first intended to serve chiefly as an outwork and protection to the city proper.

In the year 848, the Saracens appeared before Ostia, and, having taken and destroyed this center of Roman commerce, threatened the Eternal City with a similar fate. But their hopes were disappointed. Leo IV., himself an experienced warrior, organized a well-appointed army, and, coming up with the Saracens near Ostia, gained over them a complete and decisive victory. Even the elements appeared to be on the side of the Christians. Many of the vessels of the Moorish fleet were driven to the shore and stranded by the fury of the winds. Those of the vanquished who had been fortunate enough to escape the sword of the victor and a watery grave were taken prisoners and led away to Rome, to assist in erecting and embellishing buildings projected by Leo for the adornment of the city. This victory has elicited the eloquent praises of *Voltaire*, a writer not usually partial to popes or their achievements, and has called forth the genius of *Raphael*, whose pencil has immortalized it in one of the most beautiful and spirited frescoes in the whole cycle of the twelve stanzas in the Vatican Palace.

---

[1] *Sergii II.* vita et epp., in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 799 sq. *Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1463 sq.

[2] *Leon. IV.* vita et epp., in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 853 sq. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 1 sq.

In the year 850, the Emperor Lothaire sent his son, Louis II., who had been already crowned King of the Lombards and associated with his father in the government of the Empire, to Rome, to receive from the Pope's hands the imperial crown. In the year 853, the Pope also anointed the English prince *Alfred*, son of Ethelwolf, King of Wessex, who had been sent to Rome, to be educated, when he was only five years of age. If we except Charlemagne, Alfred was unquestionably the most eminent of all Christian princes. This same year, the Pope held a *synod at Rome*, attended by sixty-seven bishops, at which forty-two canons were enacted, giving excellent precepts and rules for the observance of ecclesiastical discipline. During this pontificate, public documents were for the first time issued, bearing a date indicating the year of the Pontiff's reign.

A commander of militia, by name Daniel, having represented to the Emperor Louis that there had been a plot set on foot, which was then being rapidly carried into execution, for the destruction of the Franks, so worked upon the mind of the latter that he at once set out for Rome at the head of a numerous army. The Pope faced the Emperor with firmness and resolution, boldly denying the truth of the representation; and Louis, after having listened to the story of Gratian, also a commander of militia, and the person charged with being the head of the plot, but who satisfactorily cleared himself of the imputation, and proved Daniel to be a slanderer, broke up his camp, and withdrew from Rome.

According to a fable related by some chroniclers, who lived from the eleventh to the thirteenth century—such as *Marianus Scotus* (†A. D. 1086), *Martinus Polonus* (†A. D. 1278), and *Stephen de Borbon* (†A. D. 1261)—a female occupied the Papal throne, in the interval between the death of Leo IV., July 17, A. D. 855, and the accession of Benedict III. The fable represents this female as having been born at *Mentz*, and educated at *Athens*, in the arts and sciences. And it goes on to relate further, that she ascended the Papal throne under the name of John VIII., and that, on a certain occasion, during a procession from the *Vatican*, she was suddenly taken with the pangs of childbirth, and forced to submit to the humiliation of exposing her sex, and the imposition she had practiced upon the public. But it is now established, beyond all question, that Benedict (A. D. 855–858) was the *immediate* successor to Leo, and that consequently the imaginary interval between the two reigns is the merest fiction. Moreover, the fable is not mentioned by any writer from the ninth to the eleventh century,[1] and is disproved by the testimony of well-established facts. The story, though of doubtful origin, had about it the flavor of romance, and when gracefully decked out to meet the popular taste, like all fiction, had the charm of novelty, and ran its course. But even Protestants, after having examined the matter, and subjected the supposed facts upon which it rested to the canons of historical criticism, have pronounced the whole story as a fiction.[2]

---

[1] Some of the manuscripts of *Anastasius the Librarian*, a writer of the ninth century, do not contain it, while it is introduced into others from the works of *Martinus Polonus*. Neither is it to be found in the oldest manuscripts of this author—quite the contrary; for in them the opening words of the life of Benedict run as follows: "Immediately after the death of Leo IV., Benedict was unanimously chosen to succeed him."

Moreover, the short passage relating to this affair, contained in the works of *Marianus Scotus* († A. D. 1086) and of *Sigebert of Gemblours* († A. D. 1112), is by no means authentic; for, according to *Pertz*, Monum. Germ., T. V., p. 551, and T. VI., pp. 340, 370, it is to be found only in the older *printed* editions of the writings of these authors, and *not* in the *manuscript* copies. That this tale is a fiction, is evident from the account given of it in *Martinus Polonus*, the first writer to mention it, who represents the pseudo pope as residing at the Vatican, whereas it is well known, that, until the eleventh century, the Popes uniformly resided at the Lateran Palace.

Moreover, it has been proved to a demonstration, that *Martinus Polonus* himself was entirely ignorant of this fable, and that it was introduced into his chronicle between the years 1278 and 1312. Cf. *Döllinger*, Papal Fables, p. 10 sq.

[2] The testimony of *Hincmar* is here of special importance (Ep. 26 ad Nicol. I., A. D. 867, opp. ed. *Sirmond*, T. II., p. 298). It is here related that a messenger whom Hincmar had sent to obtain a favor from Pope Leo, hearing of the latter's death while on his way, continued his journey, and, having arrived at Rome, had his master's prayer granted by Benedict.

The *Diploma of the Monastery of Corbie* (*Mabillon*, de re diplomat., p. 436; *Mansi*, T. XV., p. 113,) is equally decisive of the question.

Finally, there exists a Roman *Denarius*, bearing the names of Benedict and Lothaire, concerning which Carol. Jos. Garampi published a very learned dissertation at Rome, in 1749, entitled "*De nummo argenteo Benedicti III. Pont. Max.*" This silver coin bears upon its obverse the words *SS. Petrus;* running round, in the form of a circle, in the center of which is the monogram, *Be. Pa.;* and on its reverse, arranged in a similar order, is the inscription, *Holtharius Imp.*, within which is the word *Pius*. The reason for having the two names upon the same coin is plain enough, for while Benedict was sovereign of the Roman State, Lothaire was Protector of the Roman Church. It is not necessary to enter into any argument to show that the persons meant are really Benedict III. and Lothaire I., for this is the only instance in the whole course of history in which these two names come together.

To exclude the possibility of the reign of Pope John VIII. between the death of Leo IV. and the accession of Benedict III., it is merely necessary to ascertain, *first*, the date of Leo's death, and, *second*, to determine as nearly as possible

§ 186. *Progress of the Power of the Popes from* A. D. 855 *to* 888. *False Decretals of Isidore.*

I. The *Ensemble of the Pseudo-Isidorian Collection*, first printed in *Merlini* Collectio Concilior. (Paris. 1523, Colon. 1530, Paris, 1535) and in *Migne*, Ser. lat., T. 130; ed. **Hinschius*, along with the capitula Angilrami, Lips. 1863; in *Mansi* and *Harduin*, the particular parts inserted at the pretended dates.

II. *Coustant*, de antiq. can. coll. (epp. pontif. Rom., § 10); *Ballerini* Observat. in diss. XII. Pasch. Quesnelli de Cod. can. eccl. (*Leonis M.* opp., T. III.) *Blasci* Comment. de coll. can. Isid. Mercat. in *Gallandii* de vetust. can. collectionibus diss. sylloge, etc., Mogunt. 1790, T. II., p. 1 sq.; in the introductory comment. in *Hinschius*. *Möhler*, From and on Pseudo-Isidore (compl. works, Vol. I., p. 268–347). *Walter*, Canon Law, 13 ed., Bonn, 1861, p. 200 sq. *Knust*, de fontibus et consilio Pseudo-Isidori, Götting. 1832. **Wasserschleben*, "Pseudo-Isidore," in *Herzog's* Cyclopaedia, Vol. XII. *Gfrörer*, Age, Scope, and Origin of the Decretals of the False Isidore. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. IV., p. 61–102. **Hefele*, The present stage of the Pseudo-Isidorian Question (*Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, Vol. VIII., p. 849–860). *Rosshirt*, Literature on the Pseudo-Isidorian Question down to the times of *Gfrörer* and *Hefele*, in the Heidelberg Annuaries, 1849, n. 1, p. 62–92.

In the alliance between the Papacy and the Empire, so essential to maintenance of peace and the purity of morals through-

---

when the denarius was coined. Now, all accurate chroniclers state that Leo IV. died July 17, 855. This is the date given by *Anastasius the Librarian* and the *Annalist of St. Bertin*, who says: "Anno 855, mense Augusti (16 Cal. Augusti), Leo Ap. Sedis Antistes defunctus est, eique Benedictus successit." On the other hand, it is historically certain that Lothaire died September 28, 855, in the monastery of Prüm, near Treves. Hence, the denarius could not have been coined later than the latter part of September, when, as the inscriptions show, Benedict III. was already on the Papal throne, which he could not have ascended prior to July 17th preceding, when Leo IV. died. Thus we have the two pontificates brought within a trifle more than two months of each other—an interval entirely too short to bear out the theory of the fiction, which says that the Papess Joan reigned two years five months and four days.

See *Köhler's* Pleasures of Numismatics, Vol. XX., p. 305. There is also extant a diploma which Benedict III. issued October 7, 855, or very shortly after his elevation to the Papal chair.

Again, there is no mention of any disturbance having taken place in the early part of Benedict's reign, or of his being obliged to rid himself of this supposititious female Pope. Writers do indeed speak of a schism which took place in the beginning of this pontificate, but its author was one Anastasius.

Again, we have the positive testimony of a multitude of contemporary writers, who place Benedict III. immediately after Leo IV., in an unbroken line of succession. One of these, *Ado* of Vienne, then residing in Rome, writes as follows: "Pontifex Romanus Gregorius moritur, atque ipsius loco Sergius out Christendom, the spiritual authority increased in influence and efficiency in proportion as the imperial power waned and ceased to be respected. It rose upon the ruins of imperial power, and became indispensable as a check upon those disorders which grew out of a contempt for the laws, depravity of morals, and barbaric incursions. Developed in this way, it was shortly defended and sustained by the principles set forth in the False Decretals of Isidore, the character of which we shall now examine.

There existed, in each of the national churches, a collection of ecclesiastical laws, or canons,[1] which were made use of as circumstances required. One of these collections was in use in Spain as early as the sixth century, and was subsequently attributed to Isidore, Bishop of Seville.

Toward the middle of the ninth century, a new recension

---

ordinatur; illo defuncto Leo succedit, quo obeunte Benedictus in Sede Apostolica substituitur." *Anast. Bibl.* is also most explicit on this subject (his annals, however, have evidently been interpolated); so again is *Nicholas I.*, in his letter to the Emperor Michael (Ep. 2, T. VIII., Conc. Labbei Collec. 273), and Eps. 8 and 9 to the same relative to the affairs of Photius and Ignatius, and Ep. 16, where he complains that Hincmar, having in vain endeavored to bring Leo IV. over to his own way of thinking, employed the same arguments with Benedict, who, the letter goes on to say, "Leoni successerat *in ordine* Pontificatus."

Even *Photius*, who was at pains to seek out whatever might cast odium upon the Latins generally, and the Popes in particular, does not so much as mention the fable of the Papess Joan, but, on the contrary, writes as follows: "Nobilis ille Leo . . . inclytus Benedictus, post eum in *Archieratico throno successor*." (*Palma*, H. E., Vol. II., p. 61-67.—Tr.)

The spuriousness of the tale is demonstrated by *Aeneas Sylvius* (Pope Pius II.), *Platina*, Baronius, Pagi, Leo Allatius, Lambeck, Labbe, Natalis Alexander, Jno. Geo. Eckard, among the Catholics; and *David Blondel*, Joanna Papissa, Amst. 1657. *Leibnitz*, Flores sparsi in tumulum Papissae (Bibl. hist., Goetting. 1758, T. I., p. 297 sq.) *Bayle*, in his Cyclop., art. *Papesse; Chr. Aug. Heumann*, in his Sylloge diss. sacr., Vol. I., p. 2; The literature thereon, complete, in *Sagittarii* Introd., T. I., p. 676, T. II., p. 626. *Fabricii* Bibl. gr., T. X., p. 935. Very exhaustively treated, by *Döllinger*, Papal Fables, p. 1-45. *Baronius* assigns as the cause of the rise of this fable, ad annum 879, nro. 5: Ob nimiam Joannis VIII. (in fact, rather John XI. and XII.) animi facilitatem et mollitudinem. *Gfrörer*, Hist. of the Carlovingians, Vol. I., p. 288-293, thinks it to be designed as a satire on the pseudo-Isidorian collection, and the alliance struck with the Byzantines (Greeks), as *Mentz* and *Athens* are particularly dwelt upon in the narrative of Martinus Polonus!?

[1] See Vol. I., p. 682.

of these canons appeared in France, based upon the so-called Isidorian collection, but into which many spurious fragments, borrowed from private collections and bearing upon their face incontestable evidence of the ignorance of their authors, had been introduced. This recension contained also a number of forged documents. There were, altogether, above *a hundred spurious decrees* of popes, from Clement to Damasus (A. D. 384), not to mention some of other popes, and many false canons of councils. It also contained the forged *Deed of Donation* ascribed to *Constantine.*[1] However, these decretals, which, as they stand, are now proved, both by intrinsic and extrinsic arguments,[2] to be impudent forgeries, are nevertheless, in matter of fact, the real utterances of popes, though not of those to whom they are ascribed, and hence the forgery is, on the whole, one of *chronological* location, and does not affect their essential character.

The majority of critics have confined their attention almost entirely to *questions of ecclesiastical law*, such as the Primacy, the relations of bishops to the secular power, to metropolitans, to provincial councils, and to others of a kindred nature; as if the *three parts* into which this collection is divided, in the most ancient manuscript copies,[3] contained only such, whereas their subject-matter includes *dogmatic and moral theology, liturgy, penitential discipline*, teachings on the prerogatives and dignity of the Roman Church, on the right of appeal to Rome, on the various degrees of the hierarchy, and the like.[1] The Decretals lay down the rule that only such persons as are of acknowledged virtue, tried piety, and who shall have gone through a searching examination in presence of witnesses, shall be deemed qualified to pronounce judgment.[2]

---

[1] Even Otho I. entertained very serious doubts as to its genuineness, but its spurious character was proved, beyond all doubt, by *Laurent. Valla*, De falso credita et ementita Constant. M. donatione (opp. omnia, Basil. 1540, Venet. 1592), besides a number of separate editions of this work. Cf. Vol. I., p. 42, n. 2.

[2] The first doubts as to their authenticity were raised in the twelfth century by *Petrus Comestor*. Cf. *Blasci* comm. de collect. cann. Isid. mercat. (*Galland.* syllog., T. II., c. 5, p. 30); likewise, in *Nicol. Cusanus* (in the fifteenth century), de concordia cath., lib. III., c. 2, and *Joh. a Turrecremata*, Summa eccl., lib. II., c. 101. *Laurentius Valla*, de falso credita—Constantini donatione. Their defense, attempted by the Jesuit *Turrianus*, was refuted by *Blondel*, Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes, Genev. 1728.

[3] De libris *manuscriptis* Pseudo-Isidorianis, conf. *Hinschius* in his Commentatio introductoria, p. XI. sq.

There is probably some truth in the conjecture of *Luden*, who surmises that the quarrels between Louis the Mild and his children may have given occasion to this collection of decretals. These quarrels had become so violent and so subversive of all order, that there no longer existed any respect for things sacred, and even the bishops of the Empire were violently inflamed against each other, and carried away by the strongest partisan feelings. It is claimed, that, to restrain the lawlessness, and check the violence and confusion that menaced the Church from every quarter, it was necessary to promulgate some code of laws which should carry with it the sanction of authority, and be *universally* accepted as an authentic exposition of *general ecclesiastical discipline*, and that to meet this want, the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were collected and published.

---

[1] The following is a summary of the Contents as given by *Blunt* (Doctrinal and Historical Theology, art. False Decretals: (Tr.)

The oldest edition of this collection of canons is divided into *three* parts, of which the *first* contains (after a preface extracted from the genuine collection of Isidore of Seville) [Law, Canon] the Canons of the Apostles, followed by fifty forged briefs and decrees of the thirty earlier Popes, from Clement (A. D. 91) to Melchiades (A. D. 313). The *second* part contains, after an introduction, the celebrated forged Donation of Constantine, more extracts from the preface to the Spanish collection, one extract from an old Gallic collection of the fifth century, and the canons of several Greek, African, Gallic and Spanish Councils, also taken from the Spanish collection in its augmented edition (A. D. 683). The *third* part, after another extract from the Spanish preface, contains, in chronological order, the decrees of the Popes from Sylvester (A. D. 335) to Gregory II. (A. D. 731), among which are thirty-five forged decrees, and the canons of several doubtful councils, the genuine passages being from the Gallic and Spanish collections, and from that of Denys the Little; many of these, however, falsified by interpolations. After the Decree of Gregory II., which appears originally to have closed the manuscript, there follow, in the same handwriting, several pieces under the name of Symmachus (A. D. 498–514), notably two fictitious Roman councils; this supplement being followed by a second from the same hand. To the whole is prefixed the name of St. Isidore of Seville. The forged portions treat of dogmatical questions; of the dignity, advantages, and privileges of the Roman Church; of the prosecution of bishops and other clergy; of appeals to the Papal chair; and of the due performance of a multitude of church ceremonies.

[2] Non oportet eos a judicibus ecclesiae audiri, antequam eorum discutiatur aestimationis suspicio vel opinio, qua intentione, qua fide, qua temeritate, qua vita, conscientia et religione.

It is altogether a matter of conjecture *when* these documents were *first* appealed to by any body of men whose recognition of them would invest them with an official authority; but it is probable that the Synod of Çhiersy (A. D. 857) was the first to give them this character before the public.

The collection seems to have appeared first at *Mentz*, for Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, tells us that *Benedict Levita*, Deacon of Mentz, having received it from *Riculphus*, Archbishop of Mentz, upon the return of the latter from Spain, inserted portions of it into his own supplement to the *Capitularies* of *Adelgesius* (between A. D. 840–842, or 847).

Pope *Nicholas I.* and Archbishop *Hincmar* were the first to draw general attention to these decretals.

Although arguments are not wanting which go to show that this collection is of *Spanish* origin, still those brought forward to prove that the original is *Frankish* are more numerous and convincing. The date of these decretals rests upon conjecture, and has been variously given. *Knust* places it between the years 836 and 845, or 840 and 845; *Wasserschleben* between 829 and 857; *Hinschius* between 851 and 852, and others between 845 and 857. All that is certainly known is, that it was first quoted according to its title by the Synod of Çhiersy. As Eichhorn and Theiner have remarked: "No one who had given the subject any thought could possibly have ascribed to them a *Roman origin;* much less would they have pointed to Pope Hadrian I. as their author or compiler, when it is well known that this Pope sent to Charlemagne the Dionysian Code, whose articles are far less favorable to the claims of the Apostolic See than those of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. When going through what has been said of this collection by modern scholars, one is strongly tempted to believe that they have as little knowledge of the condition of affairs in the ninth century as those writers of that age had of the centuries that went before them. Moreover, the assertion constantly made, that the one palmary object of the Decretals was the *exaltation of papal authority,* is not borne out by facts; for pseudo-Isidore, in speaking of the Pope and his rights, is careful never to forget the claims of the bishops. The author of the Decretals, whoever he may be, was certainly a Frank, and not unlikely either *Benedict Levita, Otgar,* Archbishop of Mentz (A. D. 826–847), or *Aldricus,* Bishop of Mans. In imitation of the practice of Spanish bishops, he humbly styles himself Isidorus *Peccator* (Mercator), and, throughout the whole course of his work, writes in a tone which would prove him to have been a man of piety, faith, and virtue, solicitous for the interests of the Church, and incapable of practicing fraud upon his readers."[1]

Moehler and *Rosshirt* have shown that there exists a striking *analogy* between the Decretals and the so-called *Apostolical Canons and Constitutions,* in the treatment of the subject-matter in both collections. Moreover, as the authors of the Apostolical Constitutions referred to the *Apostles* the productions of later ages, for the purpose of investing them with greater value and authority, so also did the compilers of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, antedate decrees *of popes,* and canons of councils, and ascribe the whole collection to *Isidore of Seville,* a name universally venerated in the Church.

The judgment of *Walter* is equally correct. He says: "No essential change was introduced in ecclesiastical discipline by the forged decretals. They were only an expression of the principles and tendency of the age, and things would have gone on just the same if they had never existed."[2] It should, however, be added that the compilers of the Decretals, by stating as *facts* what were only the opinions or the tendencies of the age, by giving as ancient and authentic documents such as were supposititious and modern, and by putting forward, as established rights and legal precedents, claims entirely destitute of such warrant, did, in matter of fact, *hasten* the development and insure the triumph of the very ideas and principles they advocated, signally contributed to the growth of that spirit of freedom among the bishops which made them independent of the secular power, and gave a new impulse to the increasing influence to the Head of the Church (episcopus universalis), especially in its relations to *metropolitans* and *provincial synods.* But this gain was trifling and despicable in comparison with the injury the Church suffered in consequence from her enemies, who unjustly taunted her with having, in part at least, founded her *constitution* upon a "*tissue of lies.*"

---

[1] *Hefele,* referring to *Richter's* C. L., 2d ed., p. 129, says: "It would seem that *Benedict Levita* was conscious of the forgery, for he says, in the Preface to his Collection of Capitularies, that 'the *Schedulae* collected by Riculphus were discovered only by *Otgar,*' as if it were his intention to turn away suspicion from the true author (probably Otgar or Benedict), and direct attention to Riculphus. *Hinschius* refuses to admit this conjecture."

[2] Exactly the same view had already been expressed by *Luden,* in his Universal History of the Peoples and States of the Middle Ages, Book II., ch. 10, § 208. The *same,* Hist. of the German Peoples, Vol. V., p. 473. Conf. *Hefele's* "*Something New,*" condensed in six propositions, of which, however, but two were really new, and for that very reason impracticable, in the Tübing. Quar-

As has already been stated, upon the death of Leo, *Benedict* (A. D. 855–858) was unanimously elected Pope, though much against his own will. A faction led by Arsenius, Bishop of Gubbio, and supported by imperial authority, attempted to depose him and place in his stead the cardinal priest *Anastasius*, who had been deprived of his dignity in a synod held by Leo.[1] But the Roman clergy and people offered so determined a resistance that the imperial envoys were forced to release Benedict, who had been shut up in prison for three days, and consent to his consecration, at which they themselves assisted.[2]

In the course of his short pontificate, *Ignatius*, Patriarch of Constantinople, sent him for confirmation the acts of a synod which had been held in that city, and in which *Gregory*, the

---

terly, 1847, pp. 640, 641. Freiburg Cyclopaedia, Vol. VIII., p. 854–860. (*Neander* is also of the same opinion.—Tr.)

[1] Ex gestis Rom. Pontif.: In synodo Anastasius presbyter cardinalis tituli B. Marcelli ab omnibus canonice est depositus eo quod parochiam suam per annos quinque contra canonum instituta deseruit, et in alienis usque hodie demoratur. Ex Anast. Bibl. vita Leonis IV. apud *Mansi* XIV.; Decretalium, lib. III., Tit. IV., c. 2. (Tr.)

[2] *Benedicti III.* vita et epp., in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 102 sq. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 102 sq.

unworthy Bishop of Syracuse, had been deposed. The Pope approved the Constantinopolitan Acts, and also those of the Synod of Soissons, over which Archbishop *Hincmar* presided; but, in reference to the cause that led to Archbishop Ebbo's resignation, the Holy Father gave his approval, conditionally adding to it the clause "if it be so."

Lothaire did not long survive *Leo IV.* Some time before his death (A. D. 855), he partitioned his empire among his three sons. To Louis II. he gave Italy, with the title of Emperor (A. D. 855–875); to Lothaire II. the provinces lying between the Rhine, the Scheldt, and the Maas, or Meuse, which were all called, after him, Lotharingia, and at present Lorraine; and to Charles he assigned the country of Provence. While the complications arising out of this partition were still being canvassed, and *Photius* was intriguing at Constantinople against Ignatius, the lawful patriarch, the energetic *Nicholas I.* (A. D. 858–867) was elected Pope at Rome. Louis II., being encamped in the neighborhood, came in person, to be present at the ceremony of consecration. The assertion that this is the first instance on record of the *coronation* of a Pope does not appear to be well supported.[1]

This second Elias, as Nicholas was called by Regino, while kind and affable to zealous and pious priests, was stern and relentless to such as led wicked lives. He rendered great services to the Church at a time when the Frankish dynasty was rapidly going to pieces, and the morals of nobles and bishops were daily becoming more relaxed. He comprehended clearly, and brought fully home to his own mind, what should be the duty and aim of a Pope in a season of trial and trouble like that in which his lot was cast. While the Emperor was still in the neighborhood of Rome, the Pope paid a visit to his camp; and, on this occasion, Louis, taking hold of the bridle, walked by the side of Nicholas for a considerable distance, leading his horse.

---

[1] This inference has been drawn from the words of *Anastasius*, in his Life of Nicholas I. In giving an account of the ceremonies that took place on the occasion of this Pope's coronation, he concludes, as is pretended, with the words "*coronatur denique.*" The words are indeed to be found in the place indicated, but not in the alleged collocation. The passage has been wrongly punctuated, and should be distributed into members, as follows: (Nicolaus) cum hymnis et cantibus spiritualibus in patriarchium iterum Lateranense productus est. Coronatur denique urbs, exultat clerus, laetatur senatus, et populi plenitudo magnifice gratulabatur (not coronatur denique. Urbs exultat, etc.) See *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Times of the German Emperors, Vol. III., p. 1053 sq. On the character of this pope, cf. *Regino*, ad annum 858. Post beatum Gregorium usque in praesens nullus in Romana urbe illi videtur aequiparandus: regibus ac tyrannis imperavit eisque ac si dominus orbis terrarum auctoritate praefuit. Pope Nicholas I. battling against the rudeness and immorality of his times. *Dr. Lämmer*, Pope Nicholas I. and the Byzantine Established Church, Berlin, 1857. †*Thiel*, de Nicolao I. legislatore ecclesiastico, Brunsbergi, 1864.

This grand old Pope, believing it to be his duty to interfere wherever an abuse was to be corrected, a wrong avenged, or innocence and weakness protected, took upon him the defense of Thietberga, whom Lothaire II., the vicious King of Lorraine, wished to repudiate, that he might be free to gratify a guilty passion he had conceived for Waldrade, the sister of Günther, Archbishop of Cologne (A. D. 856). Lothaire, being bent upon having the sanction of the Holy See in justification of his course, descended to the baseness of accusing his wife, Thietberga, of having, before marriage, committed an unnatural crime with her brother, the abbot Hucbert. Thietberga, as a first resource, submitted the decision of her case to the *judgment of the sword*, a species of vindication permitted by the popular superstition of the age. The champion who had taken upon himself the defense of her honor came uninjured from the combat, and she was accordingly declared innocent, and restored to her rights and dignity as spouse and queen of Lothaire. The King, however, was not to be thus balked. His unlawful passion soon suggested a fresh expedient. By threats and acts of violence, which the Queen was glad to escape at any cost, he forced her to make a confession of the crime of which she had been charged, which she did, in the year 860, before an assembly of eight bishops entirely in the interests of the King, at Aix-la-Chapelle. She repeated the same declaration before a second assembly of bishops, at Frankfort, by whom she was condemned to undergo public penance. She had, however, previously advised the Pope that something of this sort might probably take place, and warned him against receiving any such confession, made under compulsion, as true. Her words are:

"Should it come to the knowledge of your Holiness that I have finally been brought to make the false confession required of me, be persuaded that violence alone could have wrung it from me, a wretched queen, who have been more shamefully treated than the most menial slave could have been."

In the year 862, a second assembly of bishops convened at Aix-la-Chapelle, composed of *Günther*, Archbishop of Cologne, and *Thietgaud*, Archbishop of Treves, both servilely devoted to the interests of Lothaire, and the no less venal bishops of Metz, Verdun, Toul, Tongers, Utrecht, and Strasburg, rendered judgment in favor of Lothaire, and granted him permission to espouse Waldrade.

In the meantime, Thietberga, who had sought an asylum in the kingdom of Charles the Bald, protested her innocence of the crimes of which she stood accused, and called upon Pope Nicholas to espouse her cause. The Pope called an assembly to meet at Metz (A. D. 863), to investigate the whole matter; but, in order to insure a fair hearing and to secure the proceedings against any undue influence on the part of Lothaire, he directed, besides the bishops of Lorraine, the bishops of Provence, Neustria, and Germany to be present. The Pope himself sent two bishops as legates. But Lothaire, believing that he should be able to so arrange matters at the assembly of Metz as to procure a sentence in his own favor, celebrated his marriage, as has been stated, the year previous. The King did not miscalculate. He so directed affairs that none but Lotharingian bishops were able to assist at the synod, and these he was able to influence by threats and promises. He even succeeded in bribing the two papal legates. Archbishops Günther and Thietgaud, the pliant instruments of his will, directed the policy of the assembly, and succeeded in having a judgment rendered agreeably to his wishes. But the grounds for the divorce were changed, and it was now urged that there had been a marriage between the King and Waldrade previously to the union of the former with Thietberga. The bishops, having drawn up a report of their proceedings, placed it in the hands of the two archbishops, Günther and Thietgaud, whom they commissioned to carry it to Rome and lay it before the Pope. Nicholas, whom the Neustrian bishops had informed of these proceedings in advance, convoked a council at Rome in the same year (A. D. 863), and, having carefully investigated all the facts, declared that the acts of the Synod of Metz were null and void; that the assembly itself, because it had favored the cause of adulterers, was unworthy the name of Synod;[1] that the two archbishops, who arrived at Rome with the acts of the Synod of Metz while the council was in session, should be deposed from their episcopal offices and rendered incapable of exercising any priestly function; that the same punishment should be inflicted upon the faithless legates; and that the bishops who had subscribed to these foolish proceedings[2] should not receive pardon unless they would give unquestionable proofs of their repentance and submit to the instructions of the Apostolic See. Lothaire was also threatened with sentence of excommunication if he did not at once put away Waldrade.

The two archbishops, Günther and Thietgaud, instead of submitting to the equitable judgment of the Pope, withdrew to the camp of the Emperor Louis, who was then at Benevento, to whom they artfully represented that the Pope's conduct to them implied an insult to his brother, Lothaire, inasmuch as they were the envoys of that prince. Louis grew indignant at the fancied outrage that had been put upon his brother, and at once set out, at the head of his army, for Rome, with the purpose of compelling the Pope to change the sentence that had been passed upon the archbishops, or to make some other apology for the insult that had been offered to the imperial dignity. But even the capture of Rome, and the presence of a rude and barbarous army within its walls, had no terrors for Nicholas. Conscious of the justice of his cause, and obedient to the call of duty, he boldly refused to make the slightest concession. He "stood as an immovable wall against the attempts of the wicked," and declared that under no consideration would he pronounce the marriage of Lothaire with Thietberga *unlawful.*[1]

---

[1] Nec vocari synodum, sed tanquam adulteris faventum prostibulum appellari decernimus. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 573. (Tr.)

[2] Gesta insania.

The Pope proclaimed a public fast and a penitential procession, that God might deign to inspire the Emperor with right thoughts and with feelings of reverence toward the Holy See. The procession was interrupted by the rude soldiery, and the Pope was obliged to retire, for safety, to the Church of St. Peter, where he spent two days and nights in prayer and fasting. This event, and the sudden death of a soldier who had snatched a bronze cross, held in great veneration by the people, from the hands of a priest in the procession, and trampled it under foot, produced a great reaction among the soldiers. Moreover, the Emperor, having been himself stricken down by disease, came to regard these occurrences as tokens of divine anger, and sent the Empress to the Pope to ask the favor of a reconciliation. The Pope begged him to give up the cause of the archbishops and leave Rome, which he at once did. Some idea of this Pope's character when in the discharge of duty may be had from the fact that no intercession of princes or bishops could ever prevail upon him to remit one iota of the sentence which he had passed upon the two archbishops through whose intrigues the acts of the synod of Metz had been done.

Lothaire now sought to recommend himself to the Pope by professions of submission, offering to come to Rome in person, explain his conduct, and vindicate his course. But Nicholas absolutely refused to see him,[2] and through his legate, Arsenius, threatened him with excommunication unless he should immediately leave off criminal intercourse with Waldrade, and again receive and treat Thietberga as his lawful wife. Lothaire did as he was required, and gave Waldrade into the custody of the papal legate, to be conducted to Rome, and there to undergo suitable penance; but, while on the journey, she was seized and carried back again to the faithless prince. Pope Nicholas (A. D. 866) pronounced sentence of excommunication against her.

---

[1] *Hincmar*, de divortio Hlotharii regis et Theutbergae reginae. (Opp. ed. *Sirmond.*, T. I. Conf. *Mansi*, T. XV., pp. 319, 324, 373, 649.) The synodal acts of Aix-la-Chapelle and Metz, in *Mansi*, T. XV., p. 611 sq. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 539 sq.

[2] Cui interdiximus et omnino interdicimus, ut iter talis qualis nunc est non arripiat eo quod Romana ecclesia talem respuat et contemnat. Ep. 27 to Louis, King of the Germans, and Charles the Bald. (Tr.)

Lothaire now devised a new expedient for the gratification of passions. He so ill-treated Thietberga that she was glad to be rid of him at any cost, and accordingly wrote a letter to the Pope, in which she said that her marriage with Lothaire had never been a valid one; that Waldrade was his lawful wife, and that she herself proposed to enter a convent. In conclusion, she begged the Pope to pronounce judgment in accordance with these representations. The Pope was immovable. He refused to listen to her appeal, and replied, in a letter full of dignity and firmness,[1] admonishing the unfortunate Queen not to be prevailed upon by fear or force to utter a falsehood, and exhorted her to stand firm, confessing the truth, having the assurance that, should she die on this account, she would merit a martyr's reward. The Pope also wrote to the bishops of Lorraine, and to Lothaire and Charles the Bald, reminding them of their duties under the circumstances. Thietberga was obliged to retire to the territories of Charles, where she was when Nicholas died.

Pope Nicholas endeavored, in this case as in every other, to maintain or restore ecclesiastical discipline, which was rapidly becoming lax. At a diet, held in 863, abbots, bishops, and counts had already sounded the alarm, and deplored, in words of sorrow, the rapid extinction of Christian morality and public order. Should so great an outrage against the very foundation of public morality[2] go unpunished, Nicholas felt that a new sanction would be given to the lax principles which had already taken so fast a hold upon the popular mind, and he therefore pronounced sentence of excommunication upon Lothaire.[3]

Pope Nicholas acted with equal vigor in other circumstances of quite a different character. *John*, Archbishop of

---

[1] Ep. 48. (Tr.)

[2] Concil. Pistense, in *Harduin*, T. V., p. 561; *Baluz.*, T. II., p. 104 sq.

[3] Conf. *Döllinger*, C. H., Vol. II., p. 126 sq., and *Neander*, Hist. of the Church, Vol. III., p. 353 sq. (Tr.)

Ravenna, had oppressed and plundered the inhabitants of his own and neighboring dioceses. The Pope finally took the matter in hand, and ordered John to appear before a synod at Rome, and answer for his conduct. This the archbishop having refused to do, was excommunicated. He now turned to the Emperor for assistance, and the latter sent delegates with him to Rome. But Pope Nicholas, having been invited to come to Ravenna, made a visit to that city, and compelled John and his brothers to restore whatever they had taken from the inhabitants. In another contest, in which Nicholas was engaged, and one, too, which involved his supreme judicial jurisdiction, he was inflexible and rigorous in the assertion and maintenance of the rights of the Apostolic See. *Hincmar*, the talented and learned Archbishop *of Rheims*, had been long engaged in a quarrel with *Rothad*, Bishop of Soissons, whom he accused of having trespassed upon his metropolitan rights, and of many dereliction of duty. At a synod, assembled at Soissons, A. D. 861, Hincmar had Rothad deposed and imprisoned, and another bishop consecrated in his stead. The acts of this synod were sent to Pope Nicholas for confirmation, but he declined, until he should have examined further into the matter, as many bishops had already interceded in behalf of Rothad. The Pope finally decided that the acts of the Synod of Soissons were invalid, and that Rothad, after having made an apology for his conduct, should be restored, or that both he and Hincmar should come to Rome, and lay their claims before the Holy See. Rothad complied, and having remained there nine months (A. D. 864), without any one appearing against him, was pronounced free from all the alleged charges, and, returning with a letter from the Pope to the King and Archbishop, was restored to his former office and dignities.

But Hincmar now maintained that, even admitting the right of appeal to the Pope, the sentence was under the circumstances unjust, because, though Rothad had, in the first instance, appealed to the Pope, he had subsequently submitted his case to the adjudication of the bishops, and consequently, as was asserted, withdrawn it from the jurisdiction of the Holy See. This, however, was denied by Rothad, and, as Neander states, we should be slow to receive the accusations of "a passionate and ambitious man," like Hincmar. But, apart from this, Nicholas maintained that, even if Rothad had *not* appealed to the Pope, the Synod of Soissons had no authority to judge a bishop without having first received *special* jurisdiction for this purpose from the Holy See; because a case of this character, if there were any such at all, came within the category of the *causae majores*, which were reserved to the decision of the Pope alone.[1] The Pope *referred*, in justification of his course, *to the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*,[2] and when it was objected that this collection contained decrees of Popes not to be found in the collection of Dionysius the Little, he replied, that the authority of Papal decrees did not depend upon whether they were contained in this or that recension, but upon whether they were genuine and authentic, or not. He, moreover, reverted to the fact, that Hincmar had himself formerly cited the Isidorian Decretals without comment, as authoritative documents, when it suited his purpose to do so.

The three charges brought against Archbishop Hincmar were as follows: 1. That he had deposed a bishop without authority from the Pope, to whom jurisdiction, in such cases, of right belonged, because it was one of the *causae majores;* 2. That he had prevented a bishop, who had appealed to the Holy See, from traveling to Rome; 3, and finally, That having deposed a bishop, he had appointed another in his stead, without having previously consulted the Holy See.

Archbishop Hincmar finally acknowledged his fault, and wrote, in extenuation of his course, a treatise of some length, in which he declared that he acted in the belief that he was right, and according to the laws of the Church, *as he then understood them* (secundum sacras regulas, sicut eas intelleximus).

---

[1] The Pope, in his letter to the French bishops restoring Rothad, states: Etsi Sedem Apostolicam nullatenus appellasset, contra tot tamen et tanta vos decretalia efferri statuta et episcopum *inconsultis nobis deponere nullo modo debuistis. Harduin*, T. V., p. 591. (Tr.)

[2] *Nicolai I.* vita, epp. et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XV., p. 143 sq. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 119 sq. Cf. †*Otto*, de causa Rothadi, episcopi Suession. dissertatio, Vratislav. 1862.

Hadrian II. (A. D. 867–872) followed close in the footsteps of his predecessor, to whom he was not unlike in character. He had already reached his seventy-fifth year when he ascended the Papal throne. The imperial embassadors who were in the city at the time of his election, expressed their displeasure at not having been invited to assist at the election; but they were pacified when it was explained to them that this had not been done lest it might constitute a precedent, and might hereafter be appealed to as a proof that *imperial representatives had a right* to be present at the election as well as at the coronation of Popes.

Hadrian finally put an end to the difficulty arising out of the marriage of Lothaire. In the year 869, the King came to Rome in person, accompanied by his cousin Ingelberga and a suite of nobles, and having gone with the Pope to the abbey of Monte Cassino, expressed a desire to receive Holy Communion from his hands, as a proof that he was not still under sentence of excommunication. The Pope expressed his willingness, but begged him not to receive the Body and Blood of Christ if he had had intercourse with Waldrade since her excommunication by Pope Nicholas, and unless he was determined to have no further connection with her in the future. Lothaire having made solemn oath that such was the case as to his past conduct, and that he would observe a similar line of action in time to come, was admitted to Holy Communion, which he received from the Pope's hands, in token of his reconciliation to the Church. The Holy Father admitted to the Holy Table such nobles of the King's retinue as could say that they were conscious of neither participating in nor consenting to the acts of Lothaire and Waldrade. Very few of all those who accompanied the King withdrew from the altar, and both he and those who remained received with guilt upon their conscience. But as Lothaire, and all the nobles who had approached the altar with him, died a few days afterward, on their return home through Italy (A. D. 869), their death was regarded by the people as a judgment of God. Both Thietberga and Waldrade retired into convents.

Upon the death of Lothaire, Hadrian did all in his power to have his kingdom of Lorraine settled upon the Emperor

Louis, the lawful heir, who was at that time defending the States of the Church and the countries of Central Italy from the inroads of the Saracens. But Charles the Bald took no heed of either the representations of the Papal Legates or the warnings of the Pope's letters, and, being intent upon securing so great a prize, had himself crowned sovereign of Lorraine (A. D. 869), at Metz, by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. Both the clergy and nobility were devoted to his cause; and when it was objected that Louis was the lawful heir to the crown, they replied that the *privilege of election* was an ancient Germanic right, and that Lorraine had more need than ever before of a powerful sovereign who would be able to protect her borders against the Normans and the Saracens, by whom they were constantly menaced. It is to be regretted that this pontiff lessened, in some degree, the high consideration in which the apostolic authority was then held, by taking under his protection Carloman, the rebellious son of Charles the Bald, who, besides being a renegade monk, was nearly incurring the sentence of excommunication for his shameful vices; and by the bitter and fruitless struggle which he brought upon himself by espousing the cause of *Hincmar*, Bishop of Laon, against his uncle, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. The younger Hincmar, who had been accused of various violations of ecclesiastical law, and of having defied the authority of his metropolitan, was deposed by the Synod of Touzi, in the year 871. He appealed to the Pope for protection, but, under the circumstances, the latter could effect no more than to delay for a time the filling of the see of Laon.

The replies returned to the Pope's exhortations and claims by Archbishop *Hincmar* and *Charles the Bald* are significant and interesting, inasmuch as they furnish a means of forming some idea of the character of the age.[1] *Hincmar*, in writing to the Pope on the question of succession to the crown of Lorraine, says: "The Pope would do well to remember the inglorious flight of Gregory IV., in the year 834;" and in reference to the threatened excommunication: "The kingdoms of this world are not obtained by the anathemas of either Pope or bishops, but are contended for in war, and are the reward of victory. Hence, at the last assembly of the lords, secular and ecclesiastical, the announcement of threatened excommunication was received with manifestations of indignation and anger." And, speaking of himself, in connection with the lords temporal, he says: "When I drew out in words an argument based upon the text of James, iv: 1, 10, by which I showed that a neglect to keep down the sinful desires of the heart and a thirst of earthly glory were among the fruitful causes of war, and insisted on the necessity of earnest prayer, the lords temporal made reply: 'If what you say be true, go you and defend, by your prayers, this realm against the Normans and other enemies, and come not to us to seek protection. This you do not, but when there is question of your own defense, you come and ask us to defend you by force of arms. This being the case, say to the Pope that he should not command us to take a king who, being at a distance from us, can afford us no protection, and whose bondsmen the Franks will never become.' "

---

[1] *Hadriani II.* vita, epist. et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XV., p. 805 sq. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 691 sq. *Hincmari Rem.* opusc. 55. capitulor. advers. Hincmar. Laudunens., anno 870 (opp. T. II., p. 377 sq.) An acquaintance with the commotions and discussions stirred up by *Hincmar* in the Frankish Kingdom, is most important for a thorough insight into the history of the church of that kingdom, at that epoch. *Natalis Alexander*, Hist. Eccl. saec. IX., dissert. VI. and VII.;

The language of *Charles the Bald*, in which it is not difficult to detect the pen of Hincmar, is still more aggressive: "The Pope should bear in mind that the Frankish kings have ever been held to be the lords of their country, not the vice-gerents of bishops. But what hell," he goes on to say, "is that which has originated a law by which it is declared that the King appointed of God, and armed by Him with a two-edged sword, should not be allowed to punish a criminal in his own State, but must send him to Rome?"

Before his death, Hadrian had the joy of learning that the

Gess, Memorabilia of the Life and the Writings of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, Götting. 1806; *Katerkamp*, Ch. H., Pt. IV., p. 254 sq.; *Mattes* in the *Aschbach* and *Hefele* in the *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia; and *Noorden*, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, Bonn, 1863, (cf. Tübg. Quart., 1865, nro. 3,) have well presented it.

Eighth Ecumenical Council had reinstated *Ignatius* in place of the intruded Photius, as Patriarch of Constantinople, and that the Greek and Latin branches of the Church had again united.

The position of his successor, *John VIII.* (A. D. 872–882), who was obliged to decide between the conflicting claims of two rivals for the imperial crown,[1] was embarrassing in the extreme. Never, since the establishment, in the person of Pepin, of the Carlovingian dynasty by Pope Zachary, had a similar duty fallen to any pope. Of the two claimants, Louis the German, the brother, and Charles the Bald, the uncle, of Louis II., who died A. D. 875, the latter-named was more acceptable to Pope John. Charles the Bald, anticipating the movements of the unsuspecting German monarch, had crossed the Alps, marched down through Italy at the head of a powerful army, and was crowned at Rome on the feast of Christmas, in the year 875. Charles II., in his turn, relinquished his claims to the suzerainty of Italy, much to the detriment of the public peace and prosperity of that country, and acknowledged the force and validity of many important synodal decrees, making bishops independent of the temporal power.[2] Nay, more; he made no objection when the Pope appointed *Ansegis*, Archbishop of Sens, Primate of the French Church and Apostolic Vicar, whose right and duty it was to convoke synods, to make known papal instructions to other bishops, and to report ecclesiastical causes to Rome.

It was to no purpose that the bishops generally, and *Hincmar* in particular, protested against this appointment as an invasion of the rights of metropolitans.[3] But the gratitude of Charles ended here. He gave little or no attention to the other duties to which he was obliged in consequence of having assumed the imperial crown. He made no attempt either to check the boldness of the enterprising Saracens or to put an end to the existing civil discords which were so detrimental to the well-being of the empire. Under the circumstances, the Pope did all in his power to repel the Saracens, who had now approached the very walls of Rome, and were laying waste the surrounding country; but, finding that his efforts were fruitless and his resources unequal to so great an undertaking, he dispatched an embassy to France to beseech Charles the Bald to hasten to his aid. Charles crossed the Alps at the head of a large army, and was rapidly followed by Carloman, the eldest son of Louis of Germany, who was bent upon avenging the wrong his father had suffered in the loss of the imperial crown. Charles fled in terror before his enraged kinsman, and, being taken with a fever on his journey, lay down at the foot of Mt. Cenis to die October 13, 877.

---

[1] *Joannis VIII.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 1 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., P. I., p. 1 sq.

[2] *Synod. Ravenn.*, a. 877, in *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 337. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 186 sq. *Synod. Tricassina*, a. 878 (capitul. Lud. II., in *Baluz.*, T. II., p. 187). *Harduin*, l. c., p. 191 sq. *Mansi*, l. c., p. 345 sq.

[2] Hincmar, seizing this opportunity, wrote *de jure* metropolitanorum, a treatise that most perfectly characterizes the position and tendency of this *Bossuet* of the ninth century.

Pope John, deprived, by the defeat and death of Charles, of all hope of assistance, was forced to purchase the safety of Rome by the payment of an annual tribute of 25,000 marks of silver to the Saracens.[1]

According to the principle which was now universally received and acted upon, *it belonged to the Pope, in contested cases, to choose and crown the Emperor*;[2] and hence it now became his duty to select, from among the claimants of the Carlovingian dynasty, the one he might think most fit to assume and support the name and authority of Emperor.

When, at the Council of Troyes (A. D. 878), the Pope seemed inclined to favor the claims of Louis the Stammerer, the son of Charles the Bald; he next gave the preference to Boso, Duke of Lombardy, and brother-in-law of Charles the Bald; but he finally settled upon Charles the Fat, or the Third, King of Alemannia, and youngest son of Louis the German († A. D. 876). He was led to make this selection because of the deplorable condition of Italy, which now, more than ever before, was likely to succumb to the terrible energy of the Saracens. *Charles the Fat* was crowned Emperor by Pope John, in the year 881. As most of the members of the Carlovingian dynasty followed one another in quick succession to the grave, shortly after the coronation of Charles, and as he became the natural protector and guardian of the survivors, he was enabled to once more unite, under one rule, nearly *all* the countries which had formerly belonged to the *Frankish monarchy, as it had existed under Charlemagne and Louis the Mild.* But, notwithstanding these powerful resources, he was unable to make head against either his own enemies or those of the Pope. The last days of the Holy Father were embittered by the knowledge that the Saracens had made successful incursions into Italy, and were laying waste its fair fields.

---

[1] One mark of silver or gold, = to eight ounces of twenty-four carats. (Tr.)

[2] The words of Louis II., in a letter to the Emperor Basil, are most remarkable. He there places the pre-eminence of the Emperor of the West *in his being crowned by the Pope:* Praesertim cum et ipsi patrui nostri gloriosi Reges absque invidia Imperatorem nos vocitent, et Imperatorem esse procul dubio fatentur, non profecto ad aetatem, qua nobis majores sunt, attendentes, sed *ad unctionem et sacrationem, qua per summi Pontificis manus impositionem divinitus sumus ad hoc culmen provecti*, et ad Romani principatus Imperium, quo superne nutu potimur, aspicientes,—quod jam ab avo nostro *non usurpante*, ut perhibes, sed Dei *nutu et Ecclesiae judicio summique Pontificis per impositionem et unctionem manus obtinuit.* (*Baronii* ann. ad a. 871, nr. 54 sq. *Muratori*, Script., T. II., Pt. 2, p. 243.)

The letters of this Pope, which have been brought together into one collection, are a standing memorial of his untiring energy. It is true that he pronounced sentence of excommunication against bishops and powerful lay persons more frequently than any of his predecessors, and was less inclined than they to settle his difficulties by the methods of diplomacy; but a sufficient explanation and justification of this course may be found in the prevailing depravity of the age, and in the deplorable condition to which the See of Rome was then reduced. This unfortunate Pope, after having reigned ten years, and devoted, during that period, his entire energies to the liberation of Italy from Saracen invasion, died, without seeing his hopes fulfilled, or his efforts crowned with success, December 15, A. D. 882. With the close of his reign, the short period of princely authority, to which the Papacy had risen simultaneously with the establishment of the temporal power of the Church under the Carlovingian dynasty, came, for the time being, to an end.

Marinus I. (A. D. 882–884) was the first Pope who had been consecrated bishop previously to his elevation to the Papal throne. He met Charles the Fat at Modena, in 883, but the interview had no important result. The Saracens, regardless of the compact they had entered into with Pope John VIII., overran the territories of Benevento and Spoleto, and pushed their incursions as far as the walls of Rome. The religious of St. Vincent's, on the Volturno, were put to the sword, and their monastery, as well as that of Monte Cassino, destroyed (A. D. 884).

Hadrian III., who was elected in the year 884, died the year following while on his way to the Diet of Worms, whither he was going at the invitation of Charles the Fat, for the purpose of anointing Bernard, the natural son of the Emperor and heir-presumptive to the crown.

Stephen V. (VI.) was *consecrated* immediately after his election, and *without* having first obtained *the approbation of the Emperor.*[1] The latter, on this account, wished to depose him; but when Stephen had forwarded to Charles the deed of his election, to which were appended the names of the electors, and by which it was shown that the election had been approved by John, Bishop of Pavia, and the Imperial embassadors,[2] no further complaint was made.

But the inability of Charles either to defend the Empire against the invasions of the *Normans* and *Saracens*, or to quell the intestine disorders from which it was suffering, became daily more apparent. The bishops complained bitterly[3] of the absence of all order, the laxity of discipline, and the corruption of morals. "Everywhere," say they, "have we to deplore the sack of cities, the pillaging and burning of monasteries, wasted fields, and depopulated plains."

Duke Henry had been the chief support of Charles the Fat, and when the latter lost him, he was not long permitted to enjoy the honor, or retain the authority of Emperor. Too weak to assert his rights, and too incapable to maintain them, he was deposed by an assembly of princes at Tribur, at the solicitation of *Arnulph*, the natural son of Carloman, who had himself raised to the Imperial throne (A. D. 888–899). Charles survived this disgrace only two months, and died A. D. 888.

---

[1] *Stephani V.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 6 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 365 sq.

[2] Conf. *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy down to the year 885, German transl., Pt. V., p. 198 sq.

[3] *Concil. Troslejan.*, in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 265. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., f. 505.

Among the immediate consequences of the fall of the Carlovingian dynasty was the assertion of independence by the dukes of Italy and the margraves or governors of the border territories of France, each of whom, acknowledging no superior, and ambitious of the imperial dignity, necessarily involved the Popes in their quarrels. The most conspicuous of those who contended for the honor of becoming Emperor were *Guido*, or Guy, *Duke of Spoleto*, and *Berengarius*, *Duke of Friuli*. The former, after having gained two important victories—the one on the banks of the Trebia, and the other near the town of Brixen—called an assembly of the Lombard bishops at Pavia. Here certain conditions were prescribed, which the bishops thought requisite to the right and lawful government of the Empire, and to these Guido subscribed, after which he was *crowned Emperor*. This ceremony was performed first by the bishops, and afterward (A. D. 891) by Pope Stephen, at Rome. Stephen died shortly after, universally revered for his zeal and boundless charity.

He was succeeded by *Formosus* (A. D. 891–896), who was obliged to crown (A. D. 892) Lambert, the son of Guido, who, though still a minor, shared with his father the government of the Empire.

After the death of Guido (A. D. 894), Lambert governed conjointly with his mother Agiltrude, a woman of excessive ambition, whose power shortly degenerated into tyranny. A portion of Upper Italy was still in the hands of Berengarius, who had not given up the hope of placing the imperial crown upon his own head. He now took advantage of the disturbed state of society, and the feelings of indignation entertained against Lambert and Agiltrude on account of the oppressiveness of their government, to assert his claims. War was accordingly declared, and the whole of Italy, not excepting

Rome, was divided into two conflicting parties, each equally zealous in defense of its champion. To put an end to this condition of things, the Pope called to his assistance the German King *Arnulph*, who, being a prince of the Carlovingian house, declared his intention to make good his right to the government of Italy.[1] He marched into Italy at the head of an army of Germans; took Rome, where Lambert's mother had sought refuge, by storm; liberated the Pope from confinement, and was crowned by him amid the joyful acclamations of the people (A. D. 896). The Romans took the oath of fealty to the new Emperor, with the condition, however, that their obligations to him should, in no way, *interfere with the honor and loyalty which they owed to the Pope.*[2] Arnulph was quite equal to the task of maintaining himself in his new dignity, notwithstanding that Lambert, of Spoleto, and Albert, Duke of Tuscany, had formed a powerful league against him, with the purpose of putting an end to German dominion in Italy. Unfortunately he died in the third year after his coronation, and his son and heir, *Louis the Child*, was unable, owing to his extreme youth and the *terrible inroads of the Hungarians into Germany*, to successfully compete for the imperial crown.[3] Here a lamentable and disastrous era opens upon the Apostolic See and the Roman Church.

Boniface VI., having been borne to the Pontifical throne by a disorderly assembly, made up chiefly of the partisans of the late Pope Formosus, survived his elevation only fifteen days. Upon his death, the opposite party succeeded in electing *Stephen VI.* (VII.) (A. D. 896–897), who, unmindful of the dignity of his office, and yielding to the instincts of hatred, called an assembly of bishops to give judgment upon the dead Pope Formosus, who, it was alleged, had violated the Canons in accepting the See of Rome. The ground of this charge was, that Formosus had, contrary to the discipline of the West, been transferred from the see of Porto to that of Rome. Accordingly, the body of Formosus was exhumed, robed in pontifical attire, set up in the hall of the assembly, and an advocate given him to plead his cause. Then Stephen VI. (VII.), addressing the lifeless form, said: "*Bishop of Porto*, why did thy ambition lead thee to usurp the See of Rome?" Sentence of deposition was then pronounced upon him; his election to the Papacy declared contrary to the canons, and his official Pontifical acts null and void. The body was then divested of the Pontifical robes; the three fingers of the right hand, which had been the instruments of his supposed perjury, cut off; and, after other indignities had been put upon the corpse, it was cast into the Tiber. Finally, all those upon whom he had conferred Holy Orders, were deposed. Some of them were afterward banished, and others re-ordained by Stephen.

---

[1] *Formosi II.* vita, epist. et decreta, in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 99 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 423 sq. Cf. *Auxilii* libb. II., de ordinat. Formosi. (max. bibl., T. XVII., p. 1 sq.) and dialog. super causa et negot. Form. (*Mabillon*, Annal., T. II., p. 28 sq.)

[2] The oath is given in *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, Vol. V., p. 254: Juro per haec omnia Dei mysteria, quod *salvo honore et lege mea atque fidelitate Domini Formosi Papae*, fidelis sum et ero omnibus diebus vitae meae Arnulfo Imperatori, et nunquam me ad illius infidelitatem cum aliquo homine sociabo. Et Lamberto, filio Agildrudae, et ipsi matri suae ad saecularem honorem numquam adjutorium praebebo.

[3] *Dammert*, Hatto I., Archbishop of Mentz, and Louis the Child, Freiburg, 1865 (Programme.)

These proceedings so exasperated the party hostile to Stephen, that they seized him, and, having loaded him with chains, cast him into a dungeon, where he was strangled, in the month of August, A. D. 897.[1] It is also probable that the two succeeding Popes—the pious *Romanus* and the upright *Theodore* (A. D. 897 and 898)—were murdered by the party friendly to Stephen, for having declared in favor of Formosus.

B.—DEPLORABLE CONDITION OF THE PAPACY IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

§ 187. *The Roman Pontificate during its Disgraceful Dependence upon Tuscan Domination.*

Luitprandi Historia rer. ab Europ., etc. (unreliable and harshly exaggerating.) *Glaber Radulf.* Hist. Francor., libri V. *Flodoardi* Chronicon, cf. § 178. *Mura-*

---

[1] *Stephani VI.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 173 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 461 sq. *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, year 897, Pt. V., p. 263. *Bonn Periodical* of Philos. and Cath. Theolog., 1847, n. 3.

tori, Annali d'Italia, T. V. (Germ. transl., Vol. V., p. 266 sq.) *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I p. 467 sq. *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 190 sq. *Dümmler*, *Auxilius*, and *Vulgarius* Sources and Researches on the Hist. of the Papacy at the opening of the tenth century, Lps. 1866. **Hefele*, The Popes and Emperors in the Darkest Ages of the Church (Contributions toward Ch. H., etc., Vol. I., p. 227–278). *Hergenröther*, Contributions toward a Hist. of the Popes of the tenth century (Würzburg Cath. Weekly, nros. 1 and 2, year 1865). *Darras*, Ch. H., Vol. II.

After the death of Lambert (A. D. 897), and of Arnulph (A. D. 899), the supremacy of Italy was contended for with varying success by *Berengarius* of Friuli, and *Louis III.*, surnamed the Blind, King of Provence.[1] But, as if these struggles were not sufficient to fill the measure of the country's misery, the Magyars again burst in upon its fair fields and spread devastation wherever they went. To increase, if possible, this condition of affairs, the party of the margrave, Albert of Tuscany, of the infamous courtesan, *Theodora* the elder, and of her no less infamous daughters, *Marozia* and *Theodora* the younger, was all-powerful at Rome. Benedict IV. was elected to the papal throne in the year 900. He was succeeded, three years later (903), by Leo V., who was, in the same year, dethroned by Christopher and cast into prison.

Through the influence of *Marozia*, the sister of Theodora, *Sergius III.*, her favorite, who, six or seven years previously, had been set up as anti-Pope against Romanus and John IX., was recalled from exile and placed upon the Papal throne (A. D. 904–911). Much has been said, upon the authority of Luitprand, against the moral character of this Pope; but, before assenting to the grave accusations of this writer, we should bear in mind that his testimony is, if not nullified, at least greatly impaired by that of two contemporaries, viz., Deacon John and Flodoard, both of whom are witnesses to the unexceptionable life, to the virtues, the piety, and the zeal of Sergius. And their testimony is borne out by the words of his epitaph, which represents him as an "excellent pastor, beloved by all classes." He reigned seven years, during which time he conferred the pallium upon the archbishops of Hamburg and Cologne, and placed the bishopric of Bremen definitely under the jurisdiction of the former.

---

[1] Those desirous of avoiding confusion of the personages of this age, would do well to consult *Höfler's* genealogical tables (German Popes, Pt. I., App. 5), where the descent of Berengarius, Theodora, and others, is given.

The last-named measure did much toward spreading the Gospel among the heathens of the North. It was during his pontificate also that the Council of Trosly, near Soissons, was held, the canons of which have more the character of exhortations than rules of discipline. Harvey, Archbishop of Rheims, presided, and in the opening discourse, which he delivered, gives a frightful picture of the general relaxation of discipline and depravity of morals in those times. St. Bernon contributed not a little to the restoration of monastic discipline and public morals by the foundation of the famous abbey of Clugny, whose light cheered and whose benign influence comforted the hearts of many in that age of tyranny and darkness. Sergius III. died December 6, A. D. 911, and, with the exception of approving the acts of Stephen VI. (VII.) against Pope Formosus, is probably guiltless of the other charges which have been brought against him by such writers as Luitprand.

It should be borne in mind, when speaking of these times, and of the prevailing corruption, that many of those who filled the papal chair were distinguished for purity of life and disinterested zeal in God's cause. Such were *John IX.* (A. D. 898–900), *Benedict IV.* (A. D. 900–903), *Anastasius III.* (A. D. 911–913), and *Leo VI.* (A. D. 928, 929). It is well not to lose sight of this fact, for persons are inclined, judging from the accounts they read of those times, to condemn, indiscriminately, all the occupants of the Holy See as equally unworthy and selfish.

Again, it is well known that the picture of John of Ravenna, the relative of Theodora the Elder, who ascended the papal throne under the name of *John X.* (A. D. 914–928), as drawn by Luitprand, is not pleasant to look upon, whereas modern writers have drawn it, if not in bright, at least in less offensive and more harmonious colors. This Pope had proved himself a man of good parts and capacity while still Archbishop of Ravenna; and even the panegyrist of Berengarius, who will assuredly not be suspected of any partiality for him, speaks of him as follows:

"Summus erat Pastor tunc temporis urbe Johannes,
Cfficio affatim clarus sophiaque repletus."[1]

The first care of John X. was to put things to right in Italy. As a preliminary step toward the accomplishment of this purpose, he consecrated Berengarius of Friuli, Emperor (A. D. 915). He next secured an alliance for him with the Greek Emperor and with the princes of Italy. Having thus established friendly relations among all the princes, he united their forces for a desperate assault upon the Saracens, who were again overrunning Italy. Placing himself at the head of the combined army, he went forth to meet the enemy, and came up with him on the banks of the Garigliano. The Saracens fought with their characteristic daring and gallantry; but, being unable to withstand the resolute courage of the Christian army, were forced to give way on all sides. Their army was annihalated, their stronghold on the banks of the Garigliano taken and destroyed (A. D. 916), and their power in Italy broken.

The remaining days of this Pope were spent in consulting and providing for the interests of the Church. His answer to Harvey, Archbishop of Rheims, who, in the year 916, asked his advice as to how such of the newly-converted (A. D. 912) Normans as had lapsed into idolatrous practices should be treated, is characteristic of the man. He instructed the Archbishop not to enforce the rigor of the canons, as they, being young in the faith, could not bear what those of more mature years would joyfully accept, but to use forbearance, lest excessive strictness might entirely drive away these neophytes from the Church.

Upon the death of Theodora, John manifested a disposition to free himself from the degrading dependence to which he had been subjected. But Marozia, who was still powerful and in possession of the Castle of St. Angelo, had him cast into prison and put to death (A. D. 928). This woman had married Guido, Margrave of Tuscany, the conqueror of her former husband, Alberic, Duke of Camerino. She was led to take the life of Pope John, because he had entered into negotiations with Hugh of Provence, in the year 926, for the liberation of Italy, and especially of the Romans, who were groaning under the shameful servitude of these vicious women.

---

[1] Conf. *Duret*, in *Kopp's* Hist. Papers of Luzerne, Vol. I., n. 3, year 1854. *Livrani*, Giovanni da Tossignano (X), Macerata, 1859.

At the close of the short pontificate of *Leo VI.* († A. D. 929), a man distinguished for his energy in enforcing ecclesiastical discipline and for his earnest efforts to raise the standard of morality, the papal throne was filled, for a brief period, by *Stephen VII.* (VIII.), who was probably the creature of Marozia. Upon his death, this woman had her son by her first husband, Alberic, elected Pope. He is known by the name of *John XI.* (A. D. 931–936), and was, throughout his whole reign, subject to the baneful influence of either his mother or brother. In the year 932, after the death of Guido, the wily Marozia became the wife of Hugh of Provence, upon whose head she succeeded in placing the crown of Italy. Hugh, after a time, fancied that his power was sufficiently established to warrant him in aspiring to the imperial crown. The Pope had, indeed, requested him to accept it; but Alberic the Younger, a brother of Pope John, protested against this assumption as an infringement upon his patrimonial rights, took up arms in his own defense, defeated his stepfather, Hugh, and shut his mother up in prison. Having thus established his power (A. D. 932–954) as "*Princeps Romae*," or Prince and Senator of Rome, he cast the Pope, his brother, into prison, in the Castle of St. Angelo, where he kept him shut up for three years together, and, during this time, assumed and exercised all authority, both temporal and spiritual. The popes who reigned under him were nearly all men of integrity and blameless lives. Such were *Leo* VII., *Stephen* VIII. (IX.) (A. D. 939), *Marinus* II. (A. D. 943–946), and *Agapetus* II. (A. D. 946–955). But, notwithstanding their personal worth, they were, all the same, obliged to submit to a degrading and vexatious dependence. A change in the political condition of Upper Italy finally gave hope that the papacy might again rise to its pristine authority and honor.

The vassals of Hugh, but particularly *Berengarius*, Margrave *of Ivrea*, grew daily more impatient of his rule, till finally their protests became so urgent and imperative that he thought it best to again retire to his hereditary kingdom of Provence (A. D. 946). Before going, however, he conferred the crown of Italy upon his son, Lothaire, who, though only eighteen years of age, had already been associated with his father in the government of the kingdom, and was espoused to *Adelaide*, daughter of Rudolph II. of Burgundy.

Lothaire did not live long to enjoy the honors and bear the burdens of royalty. He died in 950, and was succeeded by Berengarius and his son, *Adalbert*, both of whom were elected and crowned Kings of Italy at Pavia.

The young widow of Lothaire took refuge in the Castle of Canossa to escape the hard treatment of Berengarius, who tried every means to force her to accept the offer of his son's hand.

From the beginning of the reign of *Henry I.* of Saxony, surnamed *the Fowler*, the affairs of Germany, whether in the political or ecclesiastical domain, had been in a most satisfactory condition; and the accession of *Otho I.* gave still better promise for the future. Having been invited by Adelaide, who was still shut up in the Castle of Canossa, to come to her rescue, he crossed the Alps (A. D. 951), at the head of an army, raised the seige of Canossa, drove Berengarius out of Italy, assumed the government of the kingdom of Lombardy, and sued and won the fair Adelaide (January 6, 952). At the Diet of Augsburg, held in the year 952, Berengarius consented to accept Italy from Otho as a fief of the German Empire; but having, on his return, raised the standard of revolt, he was shortly overcome and taken prisoner to Bamberg, in Bavaria, where he died (A. D. 966).

Otho was acknowledged King of Italy by a diet held at Milan, and was crowned with the Iron Crown of Lombardy. He was then invited to Rome by the Pope, declared Emperor, and again crowned (A. D. 962) and anointed.

In the year 956, *Octavian*, a youth only eighteen years of age, the son of Alberic, Duke of Tuscany, the husband of Marozia, succeeded, through the influence of his faction, in having himself raised to the papal throne. The custom, now common with popes, of changing their baptismal name upon their accession, into one more ecclesiastical in form, *was first introduced by John XII.* His pontificate lasted till the year 964.[1]

Though young in years, this unworthy occupant of the papal chair was old in profligacy, and brought disgrace upon his exalted office by his many vices and shameful excesses. *But the Church, then in a most humiliating state of bondage, can not be made responsible for the outrageous conduct of this young debauchee.* It is a little singular that one who, by his wicked life, had done all in his power to bring discredit upon the Church and Holy See, should have been himself the unconscious instrument in restoring the honor of both.

C.—THE PAPACY AFTER THE RESTORATION OF THE EMPIRE.

§ 188. *The Popes under the Saxon Emperors.*

(BOTH SAXON AND FRANKISH EMPERORS FREQUENTLY CLAIMED THE RIGHT OF TAKING PART IN THE ELECTION OF POPES.)

†*Contzen*, The Historiographers of the Saxon Emperors, their Lives, and Works, Ratisbon, 1837. **Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the German Emperors, Vol. I., p. 189 sq. *Höfler*, German Popes. *Hock*, Gerbert, or Pope Sylvester II., Vienna, 1837. *Hefele*, Contributions, etc., Vol. I., p. 253 sq. †*Damberger*, Synchronistical Hist., Vol. V. †*Floss*, Papal Elections under the Othos, Freiburg, 1858. *Zöppfel*, Papal Elections from the 11th to the 14th cent., Göttg. 1872.

In the very midst of those clouds which overhung the Christian world, and had brought on so deep a night of darkness, both Church and State took the first steps toward an amelioration of their condition.

Charles IV., surnamed the Simple († A. D. 923), King of the *West Frankish Empire*, made over to *Rollo*, the most skillful and daring of all the Norman chiefs, the province of Neustria (ever since called Normandy), in fee-simple, and that of Britany conditionally. Rollo bound himself by treaty (A. D. 911) to embrace, together with his countrymen, the Christian religion on becoming the vassal of Charles. He was baptized under the name of Robert, by *Franco*, Archbishop of

---

[1] Conf. *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopaedia, Vol. IV., p. 294–296.

Rouen, who had formerly gone on an embassy of peace to his court, and shortly after married the royal princess Gisela. The country which he had conquered was indeed wild and desolate, but this did not prevent him from giving his utmost care to its government; and the wisdom and efficiency which he exhibited in the execution of his trust merited for him the love and gratitude of the inhabitants. From this time forward, Robert and his successors protected the frontiers of the West-Frankish Empire from invasion by the Normans. Thus protected from external enemies, religion flourished within its borders, and there shortly arose the great and *learned congregation of Clugny*, destined in future time to do so much for the glory of the Church.

Christianity beautified and ennobled all that was strong and energetic in the Norman character; and it was to the efforts of the Normans, who became the most zealous propagators of the Gospel, that every country of Europe, in that age, owed the revival of the Christian religion and the spread of Christian sentiments. They carried the weight of their influence and the power of their example into *France*, with which they constantly maintained intimate relations; into *Italy*, where a descendant of Rollo established a colony of Normans; into *England*, where William the Conqueror ascended the throne; and even into distant *Russia*, which owes not only its religious and political characteristics to their genius and zeal, but even its very name to one of their leaders. It was called *Ruriscia*, or *Russia*, from Rurick, the bold Varangian chief, who came originally from Scandinavia.[1]

In *Germany*, the power of the nobles was constantly on the increase, and that of the King on the decline. What was lost by the latter was gained by the former, and so powerful did they become that even the royal commissioners, from fear of them, dared not carry out their instructions, and were not unfrequently induced to make common cause with them. It required a strong arm to defend the country against the continual aggressions of external enemies, and, as a consequence, hereditary dukedoms grew up, little by little, to supply this need. The Saxons were the first who possessed a duke of their own nation, but it was not long before the Franks, the Suabians, and the Bavarians, the three principal tribes of Southern Germany, enjoyed a similar distinction.

---

[1] *Rurik*, having been invited by the Slaves of Novgorod to come and rule over them, crossed over the Baltic from Scandinavia, accompanied by his brothers Sindf and Truvor, at the head of a small army, took possession of the country to the south of the Gulf of Finland, Lakes Ladoga, Onega, and Beloe, in 861 or 862, and laid the foundation of a monarchy. His brothers dying without issue, their principalities were united to Novgorod by Rurik. See *Cantù's* Universal History, and the art. *Rurik*, in *Chambers'* Cyclopaedia. (Tr.)

By the death of Louis the Child, the race of Charlemagne became extinct in Germany, and the Germans again asserted and exercised their ancient rights. Their *kings* were again *elected*, not indeed as formerly, by the voice of the whole people, but by the suffrages of the hereditary dukes of the four principal tribes.

Otho of Saxony, having refused the offer of the crown, recommended *Conrad of Franconia* as a fit person to wear it. This prince was descended from Charlemagne by the female line, and was a nephew of Arnulph of Bavaria. Pious, chivalric, and brave, but withal unfortunate, he was unequal to the task, either of repelling the devastating invasions of the Hungarians, or of suppressing the sanguinary feuds of the German princes. He closed his reign of six years (A. D. 911–918) by an act of magnanimity and patriotism worthy of a great prince, for which his memory is still held in honor by the German people. Conscious that the powerful Saxons, who had heretofore shown some hostility to the unity of the Empire, could alone successfully cope with the enemies of the German nation, and secure for it peace at home and respect abroad, he generously passed over the claims of his own house, and advised that his enemy, *Henry*, Duke *of Saxony*, a man already distinguished for bravery in war and prudence in counsel, should be elected his successor.

Summoning his brother Eberhard to his side when on his death-bed, he gave him the following commission: "When I shall have passed away," said he, "bear the insignia of royalty, the crown and the scepter, to Henry of Saxony, a man truly deserving of them." The commission was all the more trying to Eberhard, inasmuch as he himself would have been the natural heir to the royal crown, for Conrad died without issue; but he showed a magnanimity equal to that of his brother, by faithfully executing the will of the latter.

Henry was hunting when the messenger reached him, and from this circumstance he has been surnamed the Fowler.

Henry the Fowler (A. D. 919–936), also called the *Builder*, fully realized the promise of his youth. He placed the army on a more efficient footing, and thus repelled the attacks of the Hungarians and Danes; introduced tournaments; built strongholds; fortified cities; drove back the Slaves and Normans from the German frontier; and established the three *margravates* of Slesvig, Brandenburg, and Meissen, for the protection of the border countries. After he had completed these preparations, he met and totally routed the Hungarians, near Merseburg, A. D. 933. Before engaging in this battle, he made a vow, that, if he should be victorious, he would employ every means in his power to put an end to the vice of *simony*. The genius of Henry I. was felt throughout the whole Empire, and gave a fresh impulse to religion, politics, literature, and art.

His example was closely followed by his more illustrious son *Otho I.* (A. D. 936–973), who, like Charlemagne, again assumed and faithfully executed the office of protector of the Church.[1] He was, in consequence, frequently called to Italy to put an end to the dissensions of the two contending factions at Rome. Berengarius II. and his son Adelbert were especially notorious for their abuse of power, and the tyranny they exercised, not only over the Pope, but all Italy. Otho I. was in consequence invited to come into Italy by Pope *John XII.*, and by the bishops and nobles.[2] He entered Rome at the head of his victorious army, January 1, 962, and made the following declaration before the Pope: "I swear to thee, Pope John, in the name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, that having, by the Divine mercy, reached Rome in safety, *I shall do all that in me lies to exalt the Church of Rome and her Pastor.*[3] Never shalt thou, by my will or consent, or at my instigation, lose life, or limb, or whatever of dignity belongs to thee. Never shall I, without having first obtained thy permission, pass judgment, or issue an ordinance relative to whatever concerns either the Romans or thyself, and should any portion of the Patrimony of St. Peter fall into my hands, I shall at once restore it to thee. And should I ever transfer the Kingdom of Italy to another, I shall oblige such one to promise under oath to his new lord that he will do all in his power *to uphold thy authority and defend the Patrimony of St. Peter*." Then both the Pope and the Romans swore upon the tomb of St. Peter "never to give either aid or encouragement to Berengarius and Adelbert, the enemies of Otho." Otho—who, as has been stated, had already received the iron crown of Lombardy—was anointed and crowned Emperor, February 2, A. D. 962—*the first*, *for forty-six years, to wear the imperial crown*.[1] A few days after, February 13th, the Emperor published his celebrated diploma,[2] by which he confirmed to the Holy See all the donations that had been made to it by Pepin and Charlemagne. He therein specified by name all the provinces, cities, towns, boroughs, castles, and localities that belonged of right to the Patrimony of St. Peter. Moreover, in order to put an end to the scenes of violence which had hitherto been of common occurrence on the occasion of *papal elections*, he ordered that these should be conducted with the *fullest liberty*, and that the Pope-elect should promise, previously to his consecration, and in presence of the imperial embassadors, to govern according to law, and with the strictest regard to justice.

---

[1] Conf. *Giesebrecht*, in l. c., p. 241–567.

[2] *Joannis XII.* vita et epist., *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 447.

[3] *Gratiani* Decret., Pt. I., dist. LXIII., c. 33. *Watterich*, T. I., p. 45. Conf.

Muratori, Hist. of Italy in the year 962, Pt. V., p. 492. *Gfrörer*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 1242 sq., vindicates the genuineness of this oath, unjustly doubted of. *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Period of the Emperors, Vol. I., p. 456. Conf. *Hefele*, Vol. I., p. 254.

[1] *Darras*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 592. (Tr.)

[2] Diploma Ottonis imperatoris de confirmatione jurium Rom. Eccl., in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 451 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 623, in *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. I., p. 38–42. This public document is written on violet parchment, in letters of gold, and is still extant. It has often been questioned whether this beautiful copy be the *original text*. Some critics go still further, and call its very *authenticity* in doubt, as well as that of the oath of Otho to Pope John. This manuscript is probably a copy of the original diploma. Conf. *Hefele's* Contrib., Vol. I., p. 255.

When Otho was informed, upon the authority of the leading citizens of Rome, that John XII. was stained with the guilt of immorality, simony, and other vices equally heinous, he dismissed the charges with the remark: "He is still young, and may, with the example of good men before him, and under the influence of their counsel, grow better as he grows older." But while the Emperor was still at Pavia, he learned that John had entered into an alliance offensive and defensive with Adelbert, and had endeavored to persuade the Greeks and Hungarians to invade Italy, and drive the Germans beyond the Alps. Otho turned back, and laid siege to the town of Montefeltro, where Adelbert had taken refuge. After having reduced this place, he set out for Rome, where he arrived November 2, A. D. 962; but John and Adelbert, not daring to await his coming, had already fled, taking with them the treasure of St. Peter's Church. The Romans took the oath of fealty to Otho, promising never to permit any one to take possession of the See of Rome who had not first obtained his consent, or that of his son Otho II.[1]

Thus far no fault could be found with either the conduct or policy of Otho; but now, acting under the advice of the German bishops, who, though they were justly incensed at the scandalous life of John XII., were but indifferent canonists, he ventured upon a step, the evil consequences of which were felt long afterward, and involved results well-nigh fatal. He convoked (A. D. 963) a synod, to meet in St. Peter's Church, at which forty bishops and sixteen cardinals were present, for the purpose of deposing the Pope. Luitprand, Bishop of Cremona, who afterward wrote the history of his times, acted as interpreter to the Emperor, who was acquainted with no language but the Saxon. This so-called Synod indicted the Pope on the charges of incest, perjury, blasphemy, murder, and others equally enormous, and cited him to appear before its tribunal,[2] to answer to the impeachment.

---

[1] *Luitprand,* Lib. VI., c. 6. Cives vero Sanctum Imperatorem cum suis omnibus in urbe suscipiunt, fidelitatemque promittunt: haec addentes et firmiter jurantes, nunquam se Papam electuros aut ordinaturos *praeter consensum atque electionem domini Imperatoris Othonis.*

[2] Conciliabulum Romanum (Pseudo-synodus) out of *Luitprand,* VII.. p. 6–11,

The Pope, instead of complying with this demand, wrote a sharp letter to the bishops, in the course of which he said: "It has come to our knowledge that it is your intention to elect another Pope. Should you presume to carry this intention into effect, know that, in such an event, we, of our Apostolic authority, and in the name of Almighty God, do pronounce you excommunicated, and forbid you to confer orders or celebrate the Divine Mysteries." This letter and warning produced no effect. The bishops proceeded against him all the same, and he was accordingly deposed. The transaction was wholly illegal, and *in direct violation of the canons of the Church*, according to which a pope can be deposed only on two counts, viz., apostasy from the faith and obstinate persistence in heresy; and by only one tribunal, viz., an ecumenical council. Hence the bishops introduced into the sentence of deposition a clause embodying an axiom which might serve as a principle to justify their course. "An unprecedented evil," said they, "demands an unprecedented remedy."

Two days after the so-called deposition of John, Leo, a *layman*, and previously chancellor of the Roman Church, was, by the influence of the Emperor, elected Pope, and, after taking orders without observing the interstices, ascended the papal throne under the name of *Leo VIII.* After the departure of Otho, John, who had still quite a party devoted to his interests, returned to Rome, retaliated on his enemies, and drove out the antipope. He next assembled a synod, at which sixteen bishops and twelve cardinal priests were present, the majority of whom had already taken part in the former synod, declared the acts of the latter body null and of no effect, deposed and excommunicated Leo, and pronounced his ordination invalid.

No sooner had John gained this triumph over his enemies than he again went back to his former licentious habits and unseemly excesses. But, though God may tolerate such things for a time, his vengeance usually overtakes one in the end. John was suddenly stricken down with cerebral apo-

---

in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 466 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 627. Conf. *Baronius* ad a. 962 and *Natal. Alex.* h. e. ad saec. IX. et X., diss. XVI.

plexy, and died, at the end of eight days, without being able to receive the Holy Viaticum (May 14, A. D. 964).

Notwithstanding that the Romans had taken the oath of fidelity to Otho, they hated the Germans cordially; and when John had died, instead of closing the old and preventing a new schism by choosing Leo VIII. to succeed to him, they elected (A. D. 964) *Benedict V.*, whom they swore to defend, even against the Emperor himself. Even German historians concede that this Pope was both learned and virtuous—recommendations not very common in that age.

No sooner had Otho been informed of these events than he again set out for Rome. He besieged the city with a powerful army, and the inhabitants, yielding to famine rather than the sword, opened the gates to him, June 23, A. D. 964.

Otho immediately convoked a synod, at which the bishops of Lorraine, Italy, and Saxony were present. Benedict was summoned before this body, and was forced to go through the farce of having himself deposed and degraded, after which he was sent into exile to Hamburg.

It must be conceded that, whatever other faults Leo VIII. may have had, ingratitude to his imperial benefactor was not one of them. *It is said* that he published a decree "granting to Otho and his successors, forever, the privilege of naming whom they liked to succeed to them in the kingdom of Italy; of *appointing* the *incumbent* of the *Holy See*, and of investing archbishops and bishops." Should any refuse to acknowledge the propriety of placing such plenary powers in the hands of this temporal prince, he was threatened with "excommunication, perpetual banishment, or death."[1] Whether all this be true or not, it is certain that, from this time forward, the Emperors interfered more than they had previously done in the election of popes, to the great detriment of the Church and the Holy See.

---

[1] The pretended Constitutio Leon. VIII., in an abridged form, in *Gratian.*, P. I., dist. LXIII., c. 23: In synodo congregata Romae in ecclesia S. Salvatoris. Ad exemplum B. Hadriani—qui domino Carolo—patriciatus dignitatem ac ordinationem apostolicae sedis et investituram Episcoporum concessit (see above, p. 135, n. 2), ego quoque Leo Episcopus—cum toto clero ac Romano populo constituimus et confirmamus atque largimur dom. Ottoni primo, Regi Teutonicorum, ejusque successoribus hujus regni Italiae in perpetuum facultatem eligendi successorem, atque summae sedis apostolicae Pontificem ordinandi, ac per hoc archiepiscopos sive episcopos, ut ipsi ab eo investituram accipiant, et consecrationem unde debent, etc. But *Baronius* and *Pagi* justly declare this document to be

On the death of Leo VIII., in the beginning of April, A. D. 965, the Romans requested the Emperor to restore Benedict; but, while the matter was still under consideration, the latter died (July 5, A. D. 965).

The Roman clergy and people now assembled in presence of the imperial embassadors, Luitprand, Bishop of Cremona, and Otgar, Bishop of Spire, and chose John, Bishop of Narni (A. D. 965–972), a protégé of the powerful family of the *Crescentians*, which was then, for the first time, coming into prominence in Italy, to succeed to Benedict. At his consecration he took the name of *John XIII.*

A party of discontented Roman nobles, who had taken offense at the boldness with which the new Pope asserted and maintained his royal prerogatives, stirred up an insurrection within the city, seized upon John, and cast him into prison. He was shortly delivered by the opposite party of the *Crescentians*, after which he took refuge at the court of Pandolf, Prince of Capua. Otho, hearing of the indignity that had been put upon the Pope, again marched into Italy, for the third time, and inflicted summary punishment on the authors of this insurrection. Of thirteen who had taken a principal part in it, some were beheaded, some hanged, and some deprived of sight (A. D. 967). The Emperor caused synods to be held at Rome and Ravenna, and, at the latter, restored to

---

interpolated. *Muratori* (Hist. of Ital., Pt. V., p. 510) says that it is an invention of a later age: but *Pertz* (Monum. Germ., T. IV., Pt. II., p. 166 sq.), *Dönniges*, *Giesebrecht*, *Pertz*, *Gfrörer*, and *Floss* (see *Kraus*' Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 261) defend it as authentic; their position, however, is scarcely tenable. Cf. *Dönniges*, Annuary of German Law, ed. by Ranke, Vol. I., Pt. III., p. 102. The so-called "Privilegium of Leo VIII.," conferred upon Otho I., recently published by *Floss* in an *altered* and *enlarged* form, is certainly a fabrication, dating from the epoch of the contest concerning Investitures. The very manuscript is not older than the eleventh century. No less spurious is *Leonis VIII.* cessio donationum Rom. Eccl., in *Pertz*, T. IV., Pt. II., p. 168 sq. For particulars concerning the various *forms* and the *contents* of this Diploma, consult *Hefele's* Contrib., Vol. I., p. 268–273.

the Pope the city itself, and all those portions of the exerchate that had been seized by the last kings of Italy. But these can not have remained long in the power of the Holy See, for shortly afterward we find the Venetians in possession of Ferrara, Comacchio, Ravenna, and other cities of the exarchate.

The Pope now crowned Otho II., a youth only fourteen years of age, who, throughout the whole course of his life, proclaimed, both by word and deed, and by the adoption of the symbolical *Imperial Globe*[1] surmounted by a cross, which his father had already impressed upon all his own seals, the great principle that an *alliance between Church and State is essential.*

For long after he had passed away, a grateful people held his memory in benediction; and it was a common saying among them that, after Charlemagne, no one had worn the imperial crown with more honor, or had had the conversion of Pagan nations, the restoration of order, and the progress and glory of the Church more at heart. And this, it was said, should be ascribed to the fact that he sought not his own glory, but that of his Savior. He therefore justly merited the title of "Great," which posterity has willingly bestowed upon him. Some modern authors have attempted to show that Otho II. respected neither the freedom nor the possessions of the Church, but the proofs brought forward in support of the charge are not sufficient to establish it. The epitaph upon his sarcophagus is probably nearer the truth:

"A Christian and a King indeed was he,
Who here within this marble lies enshrined;
His country's glory and an Empire's pride,
Whose loss a grieved and grateful world deplores."

On the death of Otho I. (A. D. 973), a fresh insurrection broke out in Rome.[2] *Crescentius*, the grandson of Theodora, roused the indignation of the people against foreign domination, and, to avenge themselves, they seized Pope *Benedict VI.*, whose election had taken place in presence of the embassadors of *Otho II.* (A. D. 973–983), cast him into prison, and murdered him. Cardinal Boniface Franco, who had been at the bottom of this plot, was then placed upon the papal throne, under the name of Boniface VII., by the party of the Crescentians; but, after having with difficulty maintained himself for one month and twelve days, he was forced to seek safety in flight. He fled to Constantinople, taking with him a large quantity of the treasure of St. Peter's Church. *Donus II.* was then elected Pope, but survived his election only four days.

---

[1] It is commonly, but erroneously, asserted, that this so-called Monde, or Globus Imperialis, was first presented by *Benedict VIII.* to the Emperor Henry II., in the year 1014. The Monde consisted of a globe of gold, around the center of which ran a zone. To either side of this was attached a quadrant, both of which met on top, and held the gold *cross*, that surmounted the *globe*, in position.

[2] On *Otho II.*, see *Giesebrecht*, Vol. II., p. 567–607.

It was now the wish of Otho II. to place upon the papal throne Majolus, Abbot of Clugny; but this holy man, believing that it would be difficult for one of his pacific habits of life to rule an insubordinate people like the Romans, declined the distinguished honor. The choice then fell upon the Bishop of Sutri, who took the name of *Benedict VII.* (A. D. 974–983). His election was approved by the Emperor, Otho II., and, during his pontificate, the Church was governed with vigor and discretion. He was succeeded by Peter, Bishop of Pavia and chancellor to Otho, who took the name of *John XIV.* By the death of Otho, which happened December 7, A. D. 983, John was deprived of the only person powerful enough to enable him to maintain his position in Rome.

Boniface now returned from Constantinople, and, supported by a powerful party within the city, seized the Pope, and shut him up in the Castle of St. Angelo, where he died of hunger, in the year 984. Happily, Cardinal Boniface was not long permitted to exercise his arbitrary authority. He died a few months later on, in the same year, and the indignities which the populace put upon his dead body may be taken as an index of the hatred which they entertained for him. He was succeeded by John XV., who, finding the exactions of Crescentius Numentanus (Cencius), the self-styled Patrician and Consul of Rome, intolerable, invited *Otho III.* (A. D. 983–1002) to come to his aid. Otho set out for Italy in the year 990; but, before his departure, he greatly offended the Germans, by giving expression to *a design of transferring the seat of his great Empire to Rome.* When he had reached Ravenna, learning that John XV. had died, he instructed the Roman embassy which had come to consult him, though he was not yet Emperor, on the choice of a Pope, to bestow the office upon his nephew *Bruno*, the aulic chaplain, who, though only twenty-four years of age, was an accomplished linguist and a respectable scholar. The Roman people and clergy, acting on the advice of the Emperor, raised Bruno to the Papal Chair—the first *German* upon whom that honor was ever bestowed. He took the name of *Gregory V.* (A. D. 996–999), and, in his turn, crowned Otho III. Emperor and Protector of the Holy Roman Church. Harmony was once more restored between the Church and the Empire, and both Pope and Emperor, when adopting measures for the good of the Church,[1] wisely mistrusted their youth and inexperience, and took counsel of such prudent and distinguished men as *Willigis*, Archbishop of Mentz; *Bernward*, Bishop of Hildesheim; *Adalbert*, Bishop of Prague; *Abo*, Abbot of Fleury; *Notker*, of Liége, and *Gerbert*, the most illustrious and learned of them all.

During the reigns of *Louis Outre-Mer*, Lothaire (A. D. 954–986), and his grandson Louis V. († A. D. 987), the last kings of the Carlovingian line, the West-Frankish Empire had passed completely under the control of Hugh the Great, Count of Paris, and, after their death, his son *Hugh Capet*[2] was elected king. With him begins the *Bourbon* dynasty, and from the year 987, the date of his ascension to the throne, the name of "*France*" has been in use. The country was then divided into a number of fiefs, of which those immediately dependent on the crown were the *four dukedoms* of Francia, Normandy (including Bretagne), Aquitaine or Guienne, and Burgundy; and the three counties of Toulouse, Flanders, and Vermandois. There was also a distinction made at the same time between *Northern* and *Southern* France, founded on the difference of *language* (langue d'oui, Française and the langue d'oc or Provençal), *manners*, and *legal codes*.[1]

---

[1] *Gregorii V.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 109 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 739 sq. Cf. *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. I., p. 97–195. **Giesebrecht*, Vol. II., p. 607–770.

[2] So called from *Cappa*, or the robe which he wore as lay abbot. (Tr.)

Hugh also renewed the friendly relations which had formerly subsisted between these countries and the Holy See.

During the reign of Hugh Capet, Arnulph, Archbishop of Rheims, had been deposed, and his see given to Gerbert, the tutor of the young prince *Robert;* but when the latter came to the throne, Arnulph was, by the authority of Pope Gregory V., restored to his archbishopric (A. D. 996). Robert was also finally persuaded to separate from Bertha, the daughter of Conrad I., Duke of Burgundy, and his own *fourth* cousin, whom he had married without having first obtained a dispensation from the Holy See. But the separation was not effected at once, or without difficulty. Robert, though a very religious man, was so devoted to his relative, that he could not bring himself to give her up on the first warning, but having been excommunicated, he at last yielded, in order to avoid the consequences that would follow having his kingdom laid under interdict.[2]

Scarcely had the Emperor, Otho III., quitted Rome, and returned to Germany, when Crescentius stirred up a fresh insurrection, drove Pope Gregory from Rome, and placed the usurper Philagathos, Bishop of Piacenza, a Greek from Calabria, upon the Papal throne (A. D. 997). But Gregory, though young, showed a becoming firmness in this crisis, and pronounced sentence of excommunication on Crescentius. Learning what had taken place, Otho hastened across the Alps, entered Rome in company with Gregory, and captured and beheaded Crescentius and twelve of his principal adherents. The antipope John XVI. was punished after the fashion of his country. His nose was cut off, his tongue wrenched from his mouth, and his eyes burnt out; and in this condition he was cast into a dungeon, where he was left to repent of his ambition, and to die a miserable death.

---

[1] *Pütz*, Mediaeval Hist., p. 72. (Tr.)

[2] We find in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 103 sq., the acts concerning the relations in which Gerbert and Arnulf stood to each other. Cf. p. 173 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 723. Cf. the notae *Severini Binii*, in *Mansi*, l. c. On Robert's marriage, conf. *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 225. *Helgaldus Floriacens.* monach., vita Roberti, c. 17 (*Bouquet.*, T. X., p. 107).

Gregory labored zealously and unceasingly for the restoration of ecclesiastical life, which had now well-nigh become extinct. When at Rome, he preached in three languages, and it was his custom to feed twelve poor men every Sunday. While in the very thickest of his labors, his life of usefulness was cut short by premature death (A. D. 999).

Through the influence of Otho, Gerbert, his second tutor, was elected to succeed to Gregory, and ascended the Papal throne under the name of *Sylvester II.* (A. D. 999–1003). He was the *first French* Pope. Born of humble parents, at Aurillac, in Auvergne, he entered the monastery of that place, and, after remaining there for a time, went to Cordova to complete his scientific studies. He was a man of great talents, which he put to the best account, and his proficiency was such in all branches of knowledge, that he was not only abreast, but in advance of his age. Having already filled with honor, successively, the archiepiscopal sees of Rheims and Ravenna under trying and difficult circumstances, he now exercised the pontifical authority with prudence and moderation.[1] After his accession, Otho, by a new diploma, added eight counties to the patrimony of St. Peter.[2]

Sylvester II. has the honor of having been the first who conceived and put forth the idea of *arming Christendom for the purpose of delivering the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel.*[3]

In the year 1002, the Emperor Otho III. died suddenly, without issue, at Ravenna, when he was only twenty-two years old.[4] Though a young man of good parts and strong character, he was not wholly exempt from the influences of his age. There was a tingle of asceticism in his nature, and he frequently withdrew, for a time, from the bustle and distraction of public life, to give himself up to prayer and meditation. His mind was filled with chimerical and extravagant plans, which the shortness of his life prevented him from attempting to carry into effect. The idea, then prevalent, that the end of the world was at hand, was not without its influence on his mind; and, as people had given up to unseemly fear at the approach of the dreaded year 1000, so, after it had passed and the world went on as before, they indulged in feelings and expressions of unwonted joy.

---

[1] *Sylvestri II.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 240 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI, Pt. I., p. 759 sq. Conf. *Hock*, Gerbert or Pope Sylvester II. and his Age, Vienna, 1837. *Büdinger*, Gerbert's place in Science and Politics, Cassel, 1851. *Olleris*, Oeuvres de Gerbert, Paris, 1867, in 4to.; *ejusdem*, Vie de Gerbert, Paris, 1867, in 12mo. On the accusation of Magic, with which popular superstition charged Sylvester II., see the apology of an ancient author, in *Hock*, p. 165.

[2] *Gfrörer* and *Pertz* defend the authenticity of this diploma.

[3] *Sylvestri II.* ep., A. D. 999, "Ex persona Hierosolymae devastatae ad universalem ecclesiam." (*Muratori*, Script., T. III., p. 400. *Bouquet.*, T. X., p. 426.)

[4] It is asserted that he was poisoned by Stephania, the widow of Crescentius,

Educated under the supervision of three female relatives—Theophania, his mother; his grandmother, Adelheid; and his aunt, Mathlda, Abbess of Quedlinburg—he had conceived a taste for *foreign* customs and the splendid court-ceremonial of Byzantium. Moreover, acting under the counsel of Gerbert, St. Romualdus of Vallombrosa, St. Odilo of Clugny, and Bernward, Bishop of Hildesheim, whose fine schemes had a great fascination for his youthful imagination, he made plans, and proceeded to carry them into execution, for the reestablishment of the Roman Empire. The design was not looked upon with favor by the Romans, who did not care to see the Rome of the Popes changed into the Rome of the Caesars of the Western Empire, and they consequently did all in their power to throw obstacles in the way of the Emperor. Nor were they the only persons who opposed it. In Germany a strong party of loyalists, headed by *Willigis*, Archbishop of Mentz, offered the most determined resistance to this attempt to *transfer the capital of the empire to Rome.* This affair was the occasion of another controversy, which would seem petty and despicable were it not for the high character of the persons engaged in it. It related to the jurisdiction over the aristocratic nunnery of Gandersheim, presided over by the haughty *Sophia*, daughter of Otho II.

---

who deliberately set herself to win the affections of the young emperor, that she might have an opportunity of avenging the death of her husband, whom the former had beheaded for participation in the conspiracy against Gregory V. (Tr.)

and Theophania, who refused to allow her church to be consecrated by the bishop of the diocese, and insisted on having a metropolitan to perform the function.[1] The German party sided with her in opposition to Pope Sylvester II. and Bishop Bernward.

There are not wanting those who confidently assert that the revival of the Empire and its incorporation with the kingdom of Germany has been a positive injury and source of weakness to the latter. But if, on the one hand, it be true that the Popes, while always the faithful allies of the German Emperors when there was question of opposing and putting down a third power, have, when such a contingency did not exist, been the steady enemies of imperialism; and that to retain German domination in Italy necessitated the carrying on of an uninterrupted war, which taxed the greatest energies of the German people;[2] it is, on the other hand, equally true that the papacy owed its rise from the corruption which surrounded it, and its liberation from the oppressive yoke of the Italian nobles, to the revival of the empire; and that the government of the Othos never could have acquired the influence which it wielded in European affairs, had the conviction not been strong upon men's minds, throughout the whole West, that no political unity, in the highest sense of these words, was possible, which in its constitution ignored the Universal Church.[3]

Sylvester did not long survive Otho III. He died in the year following (A. D. 1003), and with him perished, for the time, the hopes of the German party in Rome. The partisans of the Count of Tusculum and of the house of the Crescentians again regained the ascendancy and controlled the papal elections. The first occupant of the Roman See, after the death of Sylvester, was John XVII. (A. D. 1003), of the Tusculan family, and the next two, John XVIII. (A. D. 1003–1009), and Sergius IV. (A. D. 1009–1012), of the Crescentian family. The former family now gained the upperhand, and, for some years, raised whom they would to the See of St. Peter. *Benedict VIII.* (A. D. 1012–1024) was indeed a member of the house of Tusculum; but, for all that, did his best to serve the Church faithfully, until he was driven from Rome by the Crescentians, who set up in his place a certain Gregory. *Henry II.* of Bavaria, a grandson of Henry the Fowler, had, chiefly through the exertion of Archbishop Willigis, been elected Emperor (A. D. 1002–1024), and upon him Benedict, in his distress, called for assistance. He set out for Rome in the year 1013, and arrived the year following. Having promised to defend the Church of Rome, and to be faithful to the Pope and his successors, both he and his queen, Cunigunde, were invested with the imperial dignity.[1] Benedict displayed considerable energy in his contests with the Saracens, whom he defeated, and, with the aid of the Pisans and Genoese, expelled from the island of Sardinia.

---

[1] Conf. *Freiburg's* Eccl. Cyclopaedia, Vol. XI., p. 1105-1107; Fr. tr., Vol. IX., p. 281.

[2] *Sybel*, The German Nation and the Empire, Düsseldorf, 1862, p. 48. (Tr.)

[3] Some considerable additions have here been made from *Kraus'* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., pp. 261, 262. (Tr.)

Henry II., besides being a brave and chivalrous, was also an extremely religious man. It was his custom, on visiting a city for the first time, to repair at once to a church dedicated to the Mother of God, and there pour out his soul in prayer. He at times grew so weary of the world that, on one occasion, while visiting the abbey of Verdun, he desired to lay aside his imperial robes and put on the habit of a monk, but was dissuaded by the Prior from carrying out his purpose. He kept up the most intimate relations with the Pope, to whom he secured by diploma all the grants that had been formerly made to the Holy See in Italy, and in Germany the abbey of Fulda and such other cloisters as had been under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome.[2]

In the year 1019, Benedict made a second visit to Germany, to consecrate the beautiful cathedral which the Emperor had built at Bamberg. A new bishopric was also established at this city, the revenues of which the Emperor gave to the Pope.

---

[1] Antequam induceretur ab eodem (papa) interrogatus: *si fidelis esse vellet Romanae patronus et defensor ecclesiae;* sibi autem suisque successoribus per omnia fidelis respondit. Et *tunc* ab eodem unctionem et coronam—suscepit.

[2] *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. II., p. 367, gives a list of the churches and cloisters tributary to the Holy See.

Another evidence of the harmonious relations which existed between these two princes is to be found in the fact that Henry gave the force of imperial laws to the decrees enacted by *Benedict*, at the *Synod of Pavia* (A. D. 1018), for the repression of the vices of simony and concubinage, so common in that age. But, before a thorough reformation could be effected, Henry II. was carried to the grave. He died July 13, A. D. 1024, at Grona, near Göttingen. "Let Europe mourn," writes a contemporary author, "for she has suffered the loss of her chief; let Rome lament, for she has been deprived of a protector; let the whole world deplore the death of Henry II., the defender of Europe, the terror of the disturbers of the public peace, and the foe of every form of despotism."[1]

He was, according to his own wish, interred in the cathedral of Bamberg, where, nine years later on, his holy wife, Cunigunde, who, upon her husband's death, had entered a Benedictine convent, was laid by his side. Henry was the last of the line of Saxon Emperors, who, beginning with Henry I., had reigned for a century.

The States Ecclesiastical and Secular met and elected Conrad of Franconia, Emperor.

§ 189. *The Popes under the Franconian Emperors.*

Thietmar, Chron., in *Pertz*, V. *Glaber Radulph.* (monach. Cluniac., about 1046), Hist. sui temp. (*du Chesne*, T. IV.) *Wippo* (capellan. Conrad. et Henr. III.), de vita Conradi Salic. (*Pistorius*, T. III.) *Bonizo* (Episc. Sutrien. †1039), lib. ad amic.; seu de persecut. eccl. in (*Oefelii* Script. rer. Boicar., T. II.) *Migne*, T. CXLII.; *Desiderii*, Abb. Casin. (Victoris III. †1086), Dialogi, libb. III. (Max. bibl., T. XVIII.) *Jaffé*, Bibl. rer. Germ. II., Berl. 1865. *Stenzel*, Hist. of Germ. under the Franconian Emperors, Lps. 1827 sq., 2 vols. *Giesebrecht*, Vol. II., p. 213–336, concerning Conrad; V. II., p. 337 sq., on Henry III. Cf. *Damberger*, Synchronist. Hist., Vol. VI. *Gfrörer*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 209–627. *Höfler*, German Popes, 2 vols., Ratisb. 1839. Cf. *Will*, The Beginning of the Restoration of the Church from the Eleventh Century, Marburg, 1859–1864.

Benedict VIII., who died in the same year as the Emperor Henry, was succeeded by his brother, under the name of

---

[1] *Damberger*, Vol. V., p. 889–890, and *Gfrörer*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 1–209. *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Period of the German Emperors, Vol. II., p. 13–210. *Löger*, *Henry II.* and *Joseph II.* in their relation to the Church, Vienna, 1869.

John XIX. (A. D. 1024). This Pope placed the imperial crown (A. D. 1027) upon the head of the German King, Conrad II. (A. D. 1024–1039), the first representative of the Franco-Salic line, who had already conquered the kingdom of Lombardy. Contemporary writers of every shade of opinion represent John XIX. as zealous in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs and relentless in the pursuit and punishment of brigands. But the Emperor, who was by no means indifferent to the abuses which then existed, did not, like his predecessor, co-operate with the Pope in carrying out the decrees for the reformation of morals and the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline. Conrad looked carefully after the interests of his subjects, and, in the course of his reign, made a journey through Germany, for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of their condition, administering justice, and removing such grievances and hardships as might exist. In order the better to effect these ends, he established the *Truce of God* (Treuga Dei), by which the right of feud for the redress of private wrongs was suspended during the seasons of Advent and Lent, and on week days especially consecrated to the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord, or during the time intervening between the sunset of Wednesday and the sunrise of Monday.

The abbey church at Limburg, in the Hardt, and the unfinished cathedral of Spire, with its immense vaults in Byzantine style, as well as many other churches and monasteries, prove that Henry was possessed of taste and generosity rivaling, if not surpassing, any similar qualities in his predecessors.

Six members of the *house of Tusculum* had already been *forced upon* the papal throne, and now Count Alberic, the brother of Benedict VIII. and John XIX., succeeded, by means of unbounded bribery, in having his son, Theophylactus, a young man of only eighteen (12?), but far more proficient in vice than became one of his age, elected Pope, under the name of *Benedict IX.* (A. D. 1033–1044). For eleven years did this young profligate disgrace the chair of St. Peter. One of his successors,[1] in speaking of him, said "that it was only with feelings of horror he could bring himself to relate how disgraceful, outrageous, and execrable was the conduct of this man after he had taken priest's orders." The Romans put up with his misconduct and vices for a time; but, seeing that he grew worse instead of better, from day to day, they finally lost all patience with him, and drove him from the city.

---

[1] *Desiderius,* Abbot of Monte Cassino, as Pope Victor III. (Tr.)

The Emperor Conrad had, in the meantime, come into Italy to suppress a revolt that had broken out at Milan, and was at this time at Cremona, whither Benedict went in order to obtain his assistance. He represented to the Emperor that he was an innocent and an injured person, and, to further recommend himself to the latter, excommunicated the Archbishop of Milan, who had taken part in the revolt. Conrad then conducted him back to Rome and reinstated him in his office (A. D. 1038); but, on the death of the former, Benedict was again forced to leave the city, and his enemies, by making liberal distributions of money among the people, reconciled public opinion to the election of an antipope in the person of John, Bishop of Sabina, who took the name of Sylvester III. (A. D. 1044.) After an absence of a few months, Benedict was brought back by the members of the powerful family to which he belonged; but he had scarcely been fairly seated on his throne when he gave fresh offense to the people by proposing a marriage between himself and his cousin.

The father of the young lady refused to give his consent to the proposed union, unless Benedict would first resign the papacy, and the archpriest John, a man of piety and rectitude of life, fearing the consequences so great a scandal would bring upon the Church, also offered him a great sum of money if he would withdraw to private life. Benedict, who longed for privacy, that he might the more fully indulge his passions, listened with pleasure to these suggestions, and finally consented to resign and retire to live as a private citizen, in one of the castles belonging to his family.

It was the honest purpose of the archpriest John to raise the Holy See from the degradation to which it had been sunk by the tyranny and bribery of the nobles; but, at the same time, conscious that the only way to defeat them was to outbid them in the purchase of the venal populace, he distributed money lavishly, but judiciously, and thus secured his own election. He took the name of *Gregory VI.* But the love of power and notoriety soon grew upon Benedict. He repented of the step he had taken, and, coming forth from the privacy which had now lost its fascination, and supported by his powerful relatives, he again put forth his claims to the papacy. There were now *three* persons claiming the same dignity. This condition of affairs brought grief to the hearts of the well-disposed of all parties, and they coming together, invited Henry III. of Germany, the successor to Conrad (A. D. 1039–1056), to put an end to the confusion and restore order. On his arrival in Italy, he caused a *synod* to be convened at *Pavia* (A. D. 1046); but, as the bishops refused to condemn the Pope without having first heard him in his own defense, the Emperor caused a second one to be held at *Sutri*,[1] at which Sylvester III. was condemned and ordered to retire to cloister, and there pass the remainder of his days. Benedict's claims, owing to his resignation, were not taken into account,[2] and Gregory came forward, and, on his own motion, declared that, though he had had the best intentions in aiming at the papacy, there could be no question that his election had been secured "by disgraceful bribery and accompanied by simoniacal heresy,[3] and that, in consequence, he should of right be deprived of the papal throne, and did hereby resign it." Accompanied by his disciple, Hildebrand, he afterward retired to the monastery of Clugny. It is evident that the respect and reverence of the people for the dignity and authority of the Head of the Church must have been deep-seated, and the result of a complete and overwhelming conviction, when they were not impaired by the disgraceful circumstances just related. The words of Leo the Great were verified then, if ever. "*The dignity of St. Peter*," said he, "*does not lose*

---

[1] The Acts, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 617 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 921 sq. Conf. *Engelhardt*, Observationes de Synod. Sutriensi., Erlang. 1834, 4to. *Giesebrecht*, Vol. II., p. 399 sq. * *Watterich*, T. I., p. 71–82, where also the Laus Henrici III. imperatoris, by *Peter Damian.*

[2] *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 144. (Tr.)

[3] A dangerous or bad practice which might be traced back to an *heretical* principle, was, in the Middle Ages, called a heresy. (Tr.)

that character even when lodged in an unworthy successor to his office."

The Romans had sworn that they would not choose another Pope during the lifetime of Gregory, and they therefore begged Henry III., as he with his successors enjoyed the title of Patrician of Rome, to make choice of one. Henry selected for the office *Suidger*, Bishop of Bamberg, who took the name of Clement II. (A. D. 1046–1047.) The newly elected Pope now placed the imperial crown upon Henry and his consort.[1] At a synod, held in Rome in the year 1047, at which the Emperor also assisted, decrees were passed, declaring that any one who should purchase a benefice, or procure ordination by bribery, was thereby excommunicated; and that such as should accept orders from a simoniacal bishop, should undergo an ecclesiastical penance of forty days. This energetic work, at the beginning of his reign, gave promise that had Clement lived, he would have pursued the abuses which then existed in the Church, and particularly that of *simony*, until he had fully corrected them. But unfortunately he was not spared. Upon the representation of Peter Damian that the clergy, and notably those of the Romagna, were frightfully degenerate and corrupt, he set out to try, by personal influence, to bring them back to a sense of their obligations and the dignity of their office; and, while engaged in this work of love, took sick and died, at the monastery of St. Thomas, at Aposella, October 9, 1047.

Hearing of his death, Benedict IX. again contrived, with the aid of his powerful relatives, to gain possession of the Holy See, which he retained for eight months. On the death of Clement, an embassy at once set out from Rome to bring the intelligence to the Emperor, and request him to appoint as pope, Alinard, Archbishop of Lyons; but the latter having declined, they settled upon Poppo, Bishop of Brixen, who took the name of *Damasus II.*[2] On the very day on which Damasus ascended the Papal throne, Benedict, seized with remorse, and desiring to do penance for the irregularities of his past life, withdrew to the monastery of Crypta, or Grotta Ferrata, near Frascati, where he spent the remainder of his days, and died A. D. 1065.

---

[1] *Clementis II.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 619 sq.; in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 923. Conf. *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. I., p. 199–268.

[2] *Damasi II.* vita, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 629. Conf. *Höfler*, in l. l., Pt. I., p. 269–273.

The newly elected Pope died at Palestrina, twenty-three days after his elevation. His sudden death gave occasion to the rumor that he had come to his end by poison. This, together with the fact that the Church now seemed to be, if anything, worse off than ever, made the Papacy an object of little attraction to a German.

§ 190. *Continuation—Popes Elected through the Influence of Hildebrand.*

Leo Ostiens. (bibliothecar. at Montecassino, and later Cardinal Bishop of Ostia), Chronic. Casin. (*Muratori*, Script., T. IV.) *Petri Damiani*, Epist. et opusc. ed. Cajetani, Romae, 1606 sq.; Bassani, 1783, 4 T. in fol. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 144–145. *Bonizo* in l. c. *Desiderius*, l. l.

* *Voigt*, Hildebrand as Gregory VII. and his Age (Weimar, 1815); Vienna, 1819, 2d ed., 1846, at the beginning; especially, *Höfler*, l. c., On the German Popes, Leo IX., Victor II., Stephen IX., Nicholas II. *Giesebrecht*, Vol. II., p. 445 sq. *Gfrörer*, Pope Gregory VII., Vol. I., p. 560 sq. * *Will*, The Beginnings of the Restoration of the Church in the Eleventh Century, Marburg, 1859-1864, 2 pts.

The delegates who had set out from Rome on the death of Damasus II., met the Emperor at the great Diet of Worms (A. D. 1048). The latter conferred the Papal dignity upon Bruno, Bishop of Toul, his own uncle, a man universally beloved, and indefatigable in his efforts to do good, who was with difficulty prevailed upon to bear so heavy a burden. The monk Hildebrand, who had been selected as his companion, refused to accompany him, partly because he loved the peace and quiet of his monastery, but chiefly because he believed that it was the purpose of Bruno to govern the Church according to the principles of worldly wisdom and expedience, rather than ecclesiastical law.[1] Bruno, after his appointment, set out for Rome in the garb of a pilgrim, in order to receive the suffrages of the Roman clergy and people. Having been unanimously elected Father of the Christian world, he took the name of *Leo IX.* (A. D. 1049–1054.) He immediately ordained Hildebrand subdeacon, and appointed him administrator of the Patrimony of St. Peter, at that time not a very acceptable office, as there was not a penny in the Papal treasury, and no sources to draw from. *Henry III. had arbitrarily disposed of the estates of the Holy See to the Roman nobility and to the Normans*, and it was now in such an impoverished condition, that for two years Leo had only the slender revenues of the bishopric of Toul upon which to maintain the dignity of his court, and, in consequence, many of those who had followed him from Germany forsook him, and returned to their own country. He labored with unceasing energy to root out from the clergy the vices of *immorality* and *simony*,[1] which were then so prevalent, and so detrimental to the interests of the Church, and which Peter Damian has painted in colors, if not too lurid, certainly not a shade brighter than the reality, in his work entitled "*Liber Gomorrhianus.*"

---

[1] *Leonis IX.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 633 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 927 sq. *Watterich*, Pt. I., p. 93–177. *Wibertus*, Bruno's archdeacon at Toul, vita Leon. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I.) *Brunon.* episc. Segn. Vita Leon. (ibid., T. III., Pt. II., and in *Watterich*, l. c.) *Höfler*, l. c., Pt. II., p. 1–213. *Hunkler*, Leo IX. and his Age, Mentz, 1851.

A great synod was held in Rome in the year 1049, after the close of which Leo put every appliance to work to accomplish his purpose. He held national councils, made journeys in person through Italy and into France and Germany, and where he was not able to go himself, he sent his legates. The great majority of the clergy were found guilty of the charges that had been imputed to them; many of them were deprived of their benefices and prohibited from officiating, but by far the greater number were only condemned to undergo severe penance.

---

[1] *Leo Ostiens.:* Perrarus inveniretur, qui non esset *uxoratus vel concubinatus.* De *simonia* quid dicam? omnes paene ecclesiasticos ordines haec mortifera bellua devoraverat, ut qui ejus morsum evaserit, rarus inveniretur. Vita St. Joan. Gualb. So likewise *Desiderii* de mirac. St. Bened. dialog., lib. III., at the beginning: In tantum mala consuetudo adolevit, ut sacrae legis auctoritate postposita. divina humanaque omnia miscerentur: adeo ut populus electionem et sacerdotes consecrationem donumque Spiritus Sancti, quod gratis accipere et dare divina auctoritate statutum fuerat, data acceptaque per manus pecunia, ducti avaritia venderent, ita ut vix aliquanti invenirentur, qui non hujus simoniacae pestis contagione foedati—existerent.

It would seem that Heaven itself was visibly allied with the Pope in this great struggle, for more than one culprit was overtaken by Divine justice, and suffered what was generally regarded as a signal punishment of God.[1]

The Pope endeavored to rouse and direct the courage of the sluggish Pisans against the Saracens, who, under the lead of their chief, Mugottus, had already subdued the island of Sardinia; and to this end he sent them the standard of St. Peter, hoping that the sight of it might inspire them to undertake a crusade against these daring and aggressive infidels. Leo also put himself at the head of an inconsiderable army and marched against the Normans, who, since the year 1017, had been steadily gaining possession of the territories belonging to the Saracens and Greeks in Lower Italy. These conquerors acted with merciless rigor toward the inhabitants of the conquered territory, sacked their cities, and plundered and destroyed their churches and cloisters, and, still pursuing their conquests, finally seized upon portions of the patrimony of St. Peter, situated in Calabria and Apulia. Leo was indeed defeated by an unexpected attack of the Normans; but, for all that, he had shortly the happiness of seeing *Robert Guiscard*, the notorious chief, at his feet suing for pardon for past deeds and begging a blessing on his future undertakings. *The Normans also accepted in fief, from the Holy Father, the lands they had already conquered, and such as they might in future conquer, from the Saracens in Lower Italy and Sicily.* Although thus busily engaged at home, Leo watched with equal care and solitude over every other country of the Christian world. He maintained the most friendly relations with Edward, King of England, and advanced the interests of the English Church in every way in his power; labored to unite the Church of Spain more closely to the Holy See; offered his mediation and kind offices to put an end to the seditious and schismatical movement at Constantinople, of which *Michael Cerularius* was the head; and, in short, did whatever might in any way conduce to the prosperity of the State or the interests of the Church. His death occurred April 19, A. D. 1054, and the loss which the Church then sustained is beautifully expressed by a legend, according to which all the bells of Christendom tolled spontaneously as soon as he had passed out of this world.

---

[1] Conf. *Höfler*, l. c., Pt. II., p. 57 et passim.

After the death of Leo, Hildebrand, as plenipotentiary of the Roman clergy and people, set out for Germany to request Henry III. to name a German for the office of Pope. The Emperor reluctantly consented to part with his relative and counselor, Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstädt, whom he designated as his choice, and who, having been elected at Rome, ascended the papal throne under the name of *Victor II.* (A. D. 1055–1057.)[1] Victor, being a man of superior virtue, and now possessed of supreme authority, fully realized the hopes that Hildebrand had entertained of him. He continued, on both sides of the Alps, the combat against the vices of simony and immorality, which his predecessor, acting under the advice of Hildebrand, had prosecuted with so much vigor. He entered upon the work of reformation by holding a *synod at Florence* in May, 1055, the month after his election, in which canons were enacted against the prevailing vices. Hildebrand was sent into France, as legate, to complete there the ecclesiastical reform commenced by St. Leo, and at Lyons deposed six bishops who had been accused and found guilty of simony. The Archbishops of Aix and Arles were also invested with legatine authority for the correction of abuses in the south of France. In order to combat successfully *clerical concubinage* and *simony*, this Pope was obliged to go a step beyond what had heretofore been done by his predecessors, and demand not only the possession, but also the full administration of all estates belonging to the Church. He went resolutely to work to improve the almost hopeless condition of the Church in Italy, France, and Germany. If proof were needed to show that his administration was conducted on sound principles and directed by enlightened zeal, it might be found in the wise enactments of the synods of France and Rome held during his pontificate. He summoned *Berengarius* before a synod held at Tours, to give an explanation of the errors into which he had relapsed. He also sent his legates to Constantinople, who, by a public and solemn declaration made in the Church of Saint Sophia, disclaimed all connection with the Greek Church. The Emperor Henry, apprehending that his days were drawing to a close, called the Pope into Germany, and, dying shortly after the arrival of the latter, recommended the empress Agnes, and his young son, now only five years of age, to the protection of the Father of Christendom. Victor proved himself worthy of the confidence that had been reposed in him. By the influence which he exercised in virtue of his apostolic authority, he composed the difficulties existing between the empress and the discontented princes of the empire, regulated the affairs of State, and insured the succession of the young prince, Henry IV. He quitted Germany shortly after, and, on his way to Rome, passed through Tuscany, and while at Florence, where a number of Italian bishops had come to consult with him, fell sick and died, still in the prime of life (A. D. 1057).

---

[1] *Victoris II.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 833 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1037. *Watterich*, T. I., p. 177–188. Cf. *Höfler*, l. c., Pt. II., p. 217–268. *Will*, Victor II. as Pope and Administrator of the Empire (Tübg. Quart. 1862, p. 185 sq.)

Fortunately, the Church gained a powerful ally in Italy by the marriage of Godfrey of Lorraine to *Beatrice*, the widow of the Margrave of Tuscany. Frederic, the brother of Godfrey, who had been appointed Abbot of Monte Cassino by the last Pope, was now forcibly, and much against his own will, elected and *at once consecrated* under the name of *Stephen IX.* (*X.*) (A. D. 1057, 1058.) He continued the measures of reform which had already been undertaken by his two immediate predecessors, and, in addition, promulgated severe ordinances against the concubinage of ecclesiastics and the marriage of persons nearly related by blood.[1]

The elevation of *Peter Damian* to the cardinalate, under the title of Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, a title which placed him at the head of the Sacred College, was, as it were, the signal for the undertaking of an implacable war against the vices of simony and clerogamy. As there was then no representative of the imperial dignity, the confirmation of the new Pope by the German regency was not sought, nor could it be required. Still, lest this exercise of the right of free election should be the source of any future complications, Pope Stephen sent the prudent Hildebrand into Germany to offer an explanation to the regent Agnes, and to consult with her on other ecclesiastical affairs. But the early death of the Pope, in 1058, prevented him from bringing these negotiations to a close. Before the setting out of the embassy, Pope Stephen had the Romans to promise under oath that, in case he himself should die during Hildebrand's absence, they would not proceed to a new election until after his return. Disregarding this engagement, the Roman nobility and the laxer among the clergy, supported by the powerful influence of the Tusculan party, got together and elected John, Bishop of Velletri, who took the name of *Benedict X.* Peter Damian, and the more conscientious among the cardinals, taught by the experience of former scandals to expect naught but evil from such a proceeding, protested against the irregularity, and were in consequence compelled to leave the city. The intrigues of the new factions determined the majority of the cardinals to send a deputation at once into Germany to consult upon the choice of a fit person to be Head of the Church. Henry IV. being still a minor, the empress Agnes designated *Gerard*, Bishop of Florence, a Burgundian by birth, and a man enjoying a wide reputation for ability, learning, purity of life, and charitableness, and equally acceptable to Germans and Italians. His election was secured by Cardinal Hildebrand, in an assembly of the exiled cardinals at Siena. When Gerard, accompanied by Duke Godfrey and the better class of Italian nobles, had approached within a short distance of Rome, Benedict, laying aside the papal insignia, withdrew to his church of Velletri. Having ascended the papal throne under the name of *Nicholas II.*, he placed the antipope under ban, and deprived him of his sacerdotal faculties, but the latter soon submitted, and received absolution.

---

[1] *Stephani IX.* vita et epist., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 861 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1051 sq. *Watterich*, T. I., p. 188–202. *Höfler*, l. c., Pt. II., p. 269 sq. *Gfrörer*, Gregory VII., Vol. I., p. 562 sq.

Recent events had amply demonstrated that a change must be made in the mode of holding elections, if the baneful influence of the Roman nobles in the appointment of popes was to be counteracted. Accordingly, in a synod held at Rome, in the Lateran Palace (A. D. 1059), at which one hundred and thirteen bishops assisted, a decree was passed which ran as follows:

> "Upon the death of the Pontiff of the Universal Roman Church,[1] it shall, in the first instance (imprimis), be the duty of the *Cardinal Bishops* to come together, and take the election (of a successor) seriously in hand; they shall next take joint action with the *Cardinal Clercs*, and, finally, obtain the consent of the *other clergy*, as well as of the people, to their choice; guarding in advance against whatever may, in any way, be an occasion of bribery. If a fit person be found in the Roman Church, he is to be taken; if not, one may be sought elsewhere;[2] *provided, always, that the honor and reverence due to our beloved son Henry*, at present reigning, or to any future Emperor who shall have *personally* obtained the privilege from the Holy See,[3] shall, in no way, be impaired. But if, owing to the perversity of bad and wicked men, an honest, fair, and free election can not be had in the city (Rome), the Cardinal Bishops, together with such of the clergy and Catholic laity as have a conscientious

---

[1] Decretum de electione Romani Pontificis, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 903; in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1064 sq.; *Muratori*, Script., T. II., Pt. II.; revised, in *Gratian*, Pt. I., dist. XXIII., c. 1. The often extravagant variations are not material. Cf. *Gieseler*, Text-book of Ch. H., 4th ed., Vol. II., p. 236, note 10, and *Cunitz*, de Nicolai II. decreto de electione Pontifi. Rom. diss. hist. crit., Argentorati, 1837, and *Höfler*, Vol. II., p. 302. The text, contained in the Vatican Codex, nro. 1984 (in *Pertz*, Monum. *Leges*, T. II., in the Appendix, p. 176; in *Watterich*, Vitae Pontif. Rom., T. I., p. 229–232), has passed as correct. Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., p. 757, and Vol. V., p. 4; here the author corrects his former exposition in the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, Vol. VII., pp. 580, 581. Even this text has, most recently, been combated as interpolated by the *royalist* party. This is the opinion of *Waitz*, *Will*, *Saur*, and *Giesebrecht*. Conf. the *latter*, Hist. of the Period of the Germ. Emp., Vol. III., p. 1053, particularly * *Will*, in the Bonn Journal of Theol. Literat., year 1868, p. 438 sq. The attempts made to restore the text of the supposed *original* form are, as yet, too problematical to be able to command our assent.

[2] This restriction is deemed necessary, because the Bishop of Rome, *being at once Pope and Sovereign of the States of the Church*, could not, as experience has shown, command the confidence of his temporal subjects, if he were a foreigner. Conf. *Freiburg Periodical* of Theol., Vol. III., p. 207–212.

[3] According to *Anselm*, Bp. of *Lucca* (contra *Wibert.* antipapam II.), the clericals understood by this "due respect" a simple notification: Ut obeunte Apostolico Pontifice successor eligeretur et electio ejus Regi notificaretur. Facta vero electione et—regi notificata, ita demum pontifex consecraretur (*Canisii* lect. ant. ed. *Basnage*, T. III., p. 382); while, on the contrary, the imperialists interpreted it as implying consent, *confirmation.*

regard to duty, though few in number, may assemble *where they conveniently can*, and proceed to elect the Bishop of the Apostolic See.

"Should, however, any one acting in opposition to this our decree, promulgated with the concurrence of the Synod, secure his election, or his consecration, or his coronation, by an uprising of the people, or by any unfair means whatever, he and his aiders and abettors shall be placed under perpetual anathema, cut off from the Church, and he himself be regarded as an antichrist, an invader, and devourer of Christ's flock."

This synod also renewed all the decrees passed against *simony and the concubinage of ecclesiastics* since the pontificate of Leo IX. A decree was even passed *forbidding any one to assist at the Mass of a priest known to keep a concubine or hold criminal intercourse with a woman.*[1] The same synod obliged Berengarius to take an oath, formulated in the most precise terms, by Cardinal Humbert, which effectually put an end to all further shifts and subterfuges on the part of the former.

The paternal solicitude and indefatigable labors of Nicholas II. for the restoration and maintenance of the unity of the Church, not in theory only, but in practice as well, met with unlooked-for success even in the distant countries of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Iceland. In Milan, Peter Damian, who had been sent thither by the Pope as papal legate, by the dignity, prudence, and firmness of his conduct, dealt a decisive blow against the *heresy of simony and of the Nicolaitanes* (the marriage of priests).

Guido, Archbishop of Milan, repented of his former life, cast himself at the feet of Peter Damian, and humbly besought the legate to impose a penance upon him. The other clergy did the same, and for a time these terrible evils were checked and prevented from spreading.

Nicholas was quite as successful in withstanding the aggressions of the Normans as Leo had been. By the famous treaty of *Melfi*, *Robert Guiscard* (wiseacre) became the Pope's vassal, under the title of the Duke of Calabria and Apulia. These territories were transferred to him, together with the island of Sicily, when he should have conquered it from the Saracens, on condition of his paying a yearly tribute and taking an oath of fealty to the Holy See. *He also promised to protect the Roman Church and secure the freedom of the election of popes.*[1] And, in matter of fact, Robert sent so large a body of troops to protect the Holy See that the power of the Counts of Tusculum, those inveterate and dangerous enemies of the Popes, was broken, and their fortresses of Palestrina and Galora taken and destroyed.

---

[1] Concilium Romanum (a. 1059), can. III.: Ut nullus Missam audiat presbyteri, quem scit, concubinam indubitanter habere, aut subintroductam mulierem (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 897; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1062); in *Watterich*, T. I., p. 233.

While these events were taking place in Italy, Henry IV. was still a minor, and the aspect of political and ecclesiastical affairs in Germany was not encouraging. A general breaking up of the old condition of things seemed imminent, and surface indications began to appear of designs hostile to the Holy See. In the absence of bishops distinguished for firmness of character and holiness of life, princes exercised an arbitrary and despotic power in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs, and their interference, instead of being a protection, became an oppressive *tyranny.* The Pope, apprehensive that his days might be drawing to a close, and fully alive to the dangers which threatened the Church, the Holy See, and the independence so necessary to the exercise of its rights and prerogatives, added, probably at the Synod of Rome, held at Eastertide (A. D. 1061), the following to his previous decrees concerning the mode of proceeding in the election of popes:[2]

---

[1] The two formularies of the oath, in *Baronius* ad a. 1059, nros. 70 and 71. The first is couched in the following terms: Ego Robertus Dei gratia et St. Petri dux Apuliae et Calabriae, et utroque subveniente futurus Siciliae, ad confirmationem traditionis et ad recognitionem fidelitatis de omni terra, quam ego proprie sub dominio teneo, et quam adhuc nulli Ultramontanorum unquam concessi, ut teneat, promitto me annualiter pro unoquoque jugo boum pensionem scilicet XII. denarios Papiensis monetae persoluturum beato Petro et tibi Domino meo Nicolao Papae et omnibus successoribus tuis, aut tuis, aut tuorum successorum nuntiis. From the second, more ample formula, we quote: Sanctae Romanae ecclesiae ubique adjutor ero ad tenendum et acquirendum regalia St. Petri ejusque possessiones pro meo posse contra omnes homines; et adjuvabo te, ut secure et honorifice teneas Papatum Romanum terramque St. Petri et principatum, etc. Conf. *Gfrörer*, Gregory VII., Vol. I., p. 614 sq.

[2] In *Mansi* (T. XIX., p. 899) and *Harduin*, this last ordinance concerning papal elections is like the one above, in the Decretum contra simoniacos, added to the Roman Council of 1059; yet, as already assumed by *Höfler*, Vol. II., pp

> "Should any one be placed upon the Holy See by intrigue, bribery, or the favor of man, or by an uprising of either the people or the soldiery; or who has not been canonically and unanimously elected, and has not received the blessing of the *Cardinal Bishops* and *inferior clergy*, such one shall be regarded as an apostate, and not as Pope. The Cardinal Bishops, aided by the inferior clergy and religiously minded *laics*, may make use of anathema and of every human means to drive the intruder from the Holy See, and put in his place one who, in their judgment, is worthy of the dignity. Should they be unable to hold the election within the city, they have our apostolic authority to assemble where they list, and proceed to elect the candidate, who, besides being the most worthy, will also give promise of being the most useful to the Holy See. The Pope-elect shall at once enjoy plenary apostolic authority, in the same sense as if he had already come into possession of the throne; to govern the Church, and provide for her interests, as he may deem best, in view of the time and circumstances in which he is placed."

By this decree, all rights of the future Emperor to participate in the election of popes was withdrawn. Recent events had already proved that any future attempts of the German Emperors to interfere in the election of popes would be fraught with evil. Moreover, this decree did not deny to the German nation any *right* which might not at any former time have been withdrawn from it, for the Emperors who came to Rome to afford protection to the Holy See in its seasons of distress, and to put an end to the quarrels attending contested elections, acquired no *greater or more inalienable right* by the performance of these kind offices than did the Popes to a permanent voice in the election of emperors, because they had, in exceptional circumstances, when there were many claimants to the imperial crown, decided to whom it justly belonged. Notwithstanding that this was obviously the correct view of the matter, "the bare announcement of this modified decree on papal election created so great an excitement in Germany[1] that the bishops, acting together under the lead

---

305, 356, they probably belong to the Lateran Synod of 1061. Besides *intrinsic* reasons, there is in favor of this assumption the circumstance, that, in this decree, mention is made of *former* assemblies, said to have been held by Nicholas II. See *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 938; see also *Watterich*, T. I., p. 233: "Nihilominus auctoritate Apostolica decernimus, quod in *aliis conventibus nostris* decrevimus." The fact of an amendment of the decree in the above sense, is furthermore established by the commotion which it excited in Germany.

[1] *Hefele* (Hist. of Counc., Vol. II., p. 787 sq.) puts forward a new view concerning these two decrees of election, and also assigns a different motive for the

of *Hanno*, Archbishop of Cologne, took the matter in hand and sent a threatening letter on the subject to the Pope, and when the latter rebuked them for their pains, they declared "he had forfeited the papacy."

Things were bad enough now, but they grew immeasurably worse when, after the death of Nicholas II. (July 22, A. D. 1061), the *cardinals*, under the direction of Cardinal Hildebrand, came together and elected Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, under the name of *Alexander II.* (A. D. 1061–1073), with an utter disregard of what the Germans might think of it.[1]

Cardinal Stephen, who had been dispatched to the court of the young Henry with an account of the election, was denied an audience, and obliged to return without having had the seal on his official documents broken. A party of discontented nobles, headed by the count of Tusculum, together with such of the clergy as were hostile to a reformation of morals and disciplinary abuses, prevailed upon the empress to order a new election, under pretext that the former had been invalid, because the consent of the imperial court had not been asked. The empress, who was displeased that the Holy See had entered into an alliance with the Normans, and was glad of an opportunity to revenge herself, yielded to their request, and called an assembly of the German and Italian nobles at Basle. Thither, too, under the lead of the chancellor Wibert, came the bishops of Normandy, a country then distinguished above all others for the prevalence of the vices of simony and clerical incontinence. The assembly of Basle presented to Henry the insignia of Patrician; revoked

---

excitement which they caused in Germany. The latter, however, is not fully nor even clearly stated. He simply says: "It is impossible to fix on what was the fault of Archbishop Hanno which called for papal interference." We have been at some pains to look into this view, but, after a close examination, we can not say it is entirely satisfactory. For our own part, we prefer the theory based upon the meager hints contained in the works of *Anselm the Younger* of Lucca and of *Bonizo*, which is also adopted by *Höfler* (Vol. II., p. 357 sq.) and *Gfrörer* (Greg. VII., Vol. I., p. 633 sq.), and defended against *Hefele* by *Will*, in his work entitled "The Commencement of the Restoration of the Church in the Eleventh Century," Pt. II., Marburg, 1864, p. 172.

[1] *Alexander II.* vita et epist., *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 639. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1077 sq. *Watterich*, T. I., p. 235–290.

the decree of Pope Nicholas II. concerning the freedom of papal elections; annulled the election of Alexander, and elevated to the papal chair Cadaloüs, Bishop of Parma, formerly chancellor of Henry III., a wealthy and vicious man, whose licentious life was a sufficient guaranty to his party that no reformation would be undertaken or pushed by him. He took the title of Honorius II. (October 28, A. D. 1061.) After having obtained the approval of the empress, he assembled an army about him, marched toward Rome, encountered and overcame the army of Alexander, and entered the city, where he made a prodigal use of the great quantity of money he had brought with him. His stay was but short. Godfrey, Duke of Tuscany, and the Normans had taken up arms to defend the rights of Alexander, and Honorius, fearing their vengeance, took alarm and fled, at their approach, to his see of Parma (A. D. 1062). In Germany, during the minority of Henry, either Pope was recognized, according to the principles and policy of the party which for the moment was in the ascendant and held the reigns of government.

This condition of affairs continued until *Hanno*, Archbishop of Cologne, secured for himself the tutorship of the young prince and took the administration of the government into his own hands. He then called a synod at Würzburg, at which the election of Cadaloüs was declared null; the chancellor Wibert, who was the soul of his party, condemned, and Alexander II. proclaimed the lawful Pope.

Alexander, not content with what had already been done for the reformation of morals and discipline, sent Peter Damian into France with plenary authority to correct the abuses existing there. In England, also, Archbishop *Lanfranc* of Canterbury, ably seconded the exertions of the Pope, and set himself firmly against the sale of ecclesiastical benefices and the unchastity of the clergy.

At the *Council of Mantua* (A. D. 1064), Alexander repelled the charges that had been brought against him, and declared them to be slander.[1] In answer to those who asserted that he had violated the rights and prerogatives of the German king, he said that the privilege of confirming papal elections, which the Emperors had enjoyed, was not of such a character that, if it were withheld, the election would be invalid; that it had been granted, in the first instance, for no other reason than to prevent disorders; and that, moreover, "*what was now claimed was not such a privilege, but a license to oppress the Church.*" The relations of Church and State had already been clearly and accurately mapped out in a paper which Peter Damian sent to the Council of Osbor (Augsburg, A. D. 1062). He stated there that the two organizations, though both of Divine institution, were entirely *different* and *distinct* from each other, and hence each should be left perfectly free to work out its own development, and in this way the two would go on in peace and harmony, mutually aiding and supporting each other.[1]

---

[1] On the Council, compare *Gfrörer*, Gregory VII., Vol. II., p. 44–86, and *Will*, Benzo's Panegyric of Henry IV., with special reference . . . to the Council of Mantua, Marburg, 1856. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., p. 793 sq.

The energy, firmness, and resolution displayed by Alexander II. made his authority so respected that he was now in a position to indignantly reject the demands of the young Henry IV., who, tiring of his good and amiable wife, Bertha, and yielding to the solicitations of sensual desire, petitioned the Pope for a separation.

The King had already induced *Siegfried*, Archbishop of Mentz, to espouse his cause, by a promise to send a body of troops to assist him to collect the tithes which the Thuringians had refused to pay. As soon as the Archbishop had reported the matter to the Pope, the latter sent *Peter Damian* into Germany, who, at the Synod of Mentz, threatened the servile bishops with the censures of the Church, and declared to them that the Pope would never consent to the separation. Again, at the Diet of Princes, held at *Frankfort* (A. D. 1069), he made a bold and fearless speech in presence of the King, in which he laid open to him the turpitude of his demand, and warned him that if he should persist in his purpose and have a sentence of separation pronounced in defiance of papal prohibitions, the imperial crown would be withheld from him. The princes present also besought him to give over his intention; and thus pressed on all sides, Henry replied: "*Very good, then; I shall try to govern myself, and bear the burden which I can not lay aside.*"

---

[1] *Petri Damiani* disceptatio synodalis inter regis advocatum et Romanae ecclesiae defensorem, in *Baron.* ann. ad a. 1062, nr. 68, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 1001 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1119 sq. The words quoted here are the clausula dictionis.

It was not long before the Saxons made an appeal to the Pope, as the recognized head of religious and moral order, and the divinely appointed avenger of wrong, in which they represented that the conduct of Henry was so oppressive and tyrannous that they could no longer put up with it; and that those about him had sold ecclesiastical benefices and dignities in order to procure money to pay troops which were to be sent against his own people.

The counselors who had advised this policy were excommunicated, and Henry himself threatened with sentence of anathema by Pope Alexander. He was also required to come to Rome and justify his conduct, but in the meantime the Pope died (A. D. 1073).

The Emperor *Charlemagne* had, upon one occasion, called an assembly of the bishops at Rome, to sit in judgment upon Pope Leo III.; and now, after a little more than two centuries have gone by, a pope cites an emperor to appear before him and give an account of his conduct. The proceeding, though a novel one, was not without precedent. Even in the ninth century, after the *bishops* of the empire had set aside the claims of Louis the Mild, they became arbitrators in the quarrels of his sons, and deposed Lothaire at the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle. That *Hildebrand* was the soul of this movement, which began when the Church was covered with shame and sunk in the depths of degradation, and ended only when she was again raised to her former high estate and held in honor everywhere, there can be no doubt. But by his side, sharing his toils and cheering him in his moments of discouragement, was his faithful friend, *Peter Damian*[1] († A. D.

---

[1] He thus wrote to Hildebrand: Tuis coeptis tuisque conatibus semper obtemperare contendi et in omnibus tuis certaminibus atque victoriis ego me non commilitonem sive pedissequum, sed quasi fulmen injeci. Quod enim certamen unquam coepisti, ubi protinus ego non essem litigator et judex? Ubi scilicet non aliam auctoritatem canonum, nisi solum tuae voluntatis sequebar arbitrium,

1072). This saint used to call Hildebrand his Holy *Satan* (adversary), and declare that he was more a ruler in Rome than the Pope himself.[1]

§ 191. *Retrospect.*

The one great purpose which those had in view who first contemplated the establishment of a *Christian Empire*, and advocated its close alliance with the *Papacy*, was to lay, by the harmonious action of the temporal and spiritual powers, the tempests which the migration of nations had evoked; to subdue the fierce passions of the barbarous German tribes; to watch over the peace of Christendom; and in this way to lift the people up to the generous and noble sentiments which Christianity and Christian civilization inspire. In pursuing this common end, both princes and people readily yielded precedence to the Pope. All recognized in the symbolical ceremony of the coronation and transfer of the sword, the principle that both the imperial dignity and the temporal power were but *emanations from the fullness of spiritual authority.* Moreover, the Emperor, in regard of his moral conduct (ratione peccati), was, in the full and strict sense of the word, subject to the Pope, and this because the latter is, by virtue of his office, the divinely appointed censor of morals and custodian of justice. With him, there is, in this regard, no distinction of persons. He will be called upon to give an account to God of the conduct of an Emperor as well as of the most obscure in the humblest walks of life. Neither did the Emperor pay deference to the Pope as man, or from personal considera-

---

et mera tua voluntas mihi canonum erat auctoritas. Nec unquam judicavi, quod visum est mihi, sed quod placuit tibi. Transferred from *Kraus'* Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 265. (Tr.)

[1] This was the belief of the whole party at Rome in favor of reform. *Peter Damian*, indignant at the excessive influence of Hildebrand, gives expression to his feelings in the following caustic epigrams:

Vivere vis Romae, clara depromito voce:
Plus domino papae, quam domno pareo papae.

The following refers to the relations of Hildebrand to the Pope:

Papam rite colo, sed te prostratus adoro:
Tu facis hunc Dominum, te facit iste Deum.

in *Baron.* ad an. 1061, nros. 34 and 35.

tions, but because he recognized in him the representative of *God.* Again, the two powers were believed to be based on the same principles, and to flow from the same Source. Pope and Emperor held their power of the King of Heaven, and exercised it *in His name* and by His sanction. Working in different and distinct spheres, their efforts were directed to the same end. Hence the Emperor was frequently called, without qualification, the *Vicar of Christ* (Vicarius Christi). *Henry III.*, who had been ordained a cleric,[1] is an example of this usage. From these considerations, it will be seen that as long as Pope and Emperor were faithful to their respective missions, neither trenching upon the domain of the other, no dispute could arise between them, and no rupture separate them; and that such an antagonism was possible only when one or both acted from selfish and personal, instead of generous and politic motives.

The relations of co-ordination or subordination between the Papacy and the Empire had been frequently set forth, and the necessity of mutual harmonious action had been expressed by the *symbol of the Imperial Globe;* but perhaps no one brought out the idea more beautifully and clearly than *Peter Damian.* "Both Pope and Emperor," says he, "should exert themselves to maintain an intimate *union* between the Papacy and the Empire, to the end that the human race, exercising its religious and civil faculties (in utraque substantia), under the direction of these *two* supreme powers (per hos duos apices), may in future live in harmony, and never be again rent by divisions. These two dignitaries, inasmuch as they are the highest representatives of authority on earth, should vie with each other in acts of loving friendship, that those who are under them may learn from their example to cultivate charity. For inasmuch as the Empire and the Priesthood have, by Divine dispensation, been united through the *one* Mediator between God and man, so should these two exalted personages be so closely united by the indissoluble bond of charity, that the interests of the one would be as dear to the other as his own, and that the only distinction between them should consist in those *prerogatives granted to the Pope in person, and which none other can take upon himself to exercise.*"

---

[1] *Wippo*, in his Life of Conrad the Salic, calls this prince *vicarium Dei*, and the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A. D. 862, says to King Lothaire II.: Principi ad memoriam reduximus, ut non immemor vocationis suae, quod nomine censetur opere compleat, ut Rex Regum Christus, *qui sui nominis vicem illi contulit in terris*, dispensationis sibi creditae dignam remunerationem reddat in coelis. (*Harzheim*, T. II., p. 266.) Cf. *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. I., p. 241.

Owing to the critical circumstances of this age, when everything was in a state of disorder, it not unfrequently happened that one power was permitted to trench upon the domain of the other, and was at times invited to do so. For example, the deposition of John XII. by Otho I., notwithstanding that it was clearly uncanonical, was very generally praised as a measure affording a remedy to the evils of the age, and on this account deserving the gratitude of mankind. Again, the high-handed interference of Otho's son and grandson, and, still later on, of Henry III., in papal elections, met with an equally grateful recognition; because their conduct was inspired and sustained by Christian sentiments and a feeling of loyalty to the Church, and was required by the exceptional circumstances of the times.

But when it had become apparent that the emperors wished to claim as rights, for the purpose of enslaving and tyrannizing over the Church, powers which were, of their very nature, transitory and abnormal, but which had grown out of the special exigencies of the age, and had been granted from a feeling of confidence, then the Head of the Church conceived it to be his imperative duty to lay down precise and comprehensive principles defining the relations between Pope and Emperor, Church and State. And to this work, as we shall see presently, did the successors of Alexander II. apply themselves.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 192. *The Church in Her Relations to the State.*

†*Thomassini* Vetus and Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina, Pt. III., lib. I., c. 26–30 (de Temporabilibus Ecclesiae concessis); Pt. II., lib. II., c. 48, 49 (de Sacramento fidelitatis, quae summis principibus persolvere Episcopi et Abbates, etc.) *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., Pt. I.

The relations of the Church to the various Germanic nations somewhat resembled those which the papacy experienced in its intercourse with princes. As has been stated above, the bishops were unavoidably drawn into the meshes of feudalism. The system had come into existence in the course of the migration of nations, increased in strength and perfected its organization as years went on, and reached its fullest development amid the storms which swept over Europe in the ninth and tenth centuries. The German people, whose first business was war, now became freeholders of the soil, and ended by falling into a system and submitting to restrictions entirely at variance with the traditions and habits of life of their ancestors.

In the wars of the Carlovingian princes, the *bishops* were the most trusty allies of the crown, and, on this account, obtained a large portion of the crown-lands, which had formerly belonged to vassals, on condition that they should maintain a contingent of troops. It was especially during these years that churchmen acquired an importance in the feudal system. Even kings and emperors, particularly Otho I., conferred upon them whole dukedoms, in the belief that they were thus raising up for themselves faithful allies who would enable them to withstand the growing power of the princes of the empire. Coming into possession of their *fiefs by the law of hereditary descent*, some of these princes grew so powerful as seriously to threaten the authority of the emperor or king himself. It was therefore important for them to secure allies on whose fidelity they could rely, and of whose ambition they might not be suspicious. The bishops, in order to maintain a considerable body of troops, were under the necessity of again granting a large portion of their estates in fief to others. But no sooner had they come into the possession of these great fiefs and the exercise of secular authority than they surrendered their independence as churchmen and grew arrogant as rulers. Notwithstanding that they were dispensed from rendering personal service, on the one hand, and, on the other, threatened with the censures of the Church against those who bear arms in time of war, instead of endeavoring to appease the anger of God, they as well as abbots not unfrequently took part in the struggles of the Carlovingian family, some from a natural taste for war, and others because they were obliged by the relations in which they stood to the king and the nobility.

A large portion of episcopal and monastic possessions having in this way become identified with the feudal system, gave an opportunity to kings and princes to gradually assume an attitude dangerous at once to the liberties and estates of the Church. There can be no question that *freedom* in the choice of bishops is among the most essential conditions to the prosperity of the Church. This great principle of ecclesiastical polity, which had been guaranteed by Charlemagne and Louis the Mild, and rigorously enforced by the Council of Valence (A. D. 855), was now beginning to be either silently ignored or openly violated.

The grantors of fiefs, fancying that they and their heirs had also the disposal of the ecclesiastical dignities attached to them, generally conferred them, without regard to other qualifications, upon persons of whose personal fidelity they were assured, or who were nearly allied to them by ties of blood. And yet, by the principles of the feudal system, the *election* of bishops and the *conferring* of ecclesiastical benefices should have been left entirely to the Church. This was her protection, as the *right of inheritance* was the protection of those families which held their lands by feudal tenure. Notwithstanding this obvious right, Charles the Bald and other princes did not hesitate to appoint court-chaplains to bishoprics, and to send them to metropolitans to receive consecration. Hence, during the tenth century, many of the creatures of the crown and striplings of vicious habits were set over important sees, and even placed upon the pontifical throne.

But apart from these abuses, and in spite of them, many of the appointments made in Germany and Italy by the best kings and emperors of this epoch were beneficial to the Church; and this notwithstanding that their primary and chief qualifications consisted in being related to the royal family to which they owed their elevation. Thus, for example, *in the reign of Otho I.*, the three Rhenish archbishoprics were in the hands of his son, his brother, and his cousin.

There was still another consequence of the feudal system, no less dangerous in its results than the former. The newly elected bishops were obliged to take, besides the oath of personal fidelity, another of *feudal fealty* or *homage* (homagium), by which they bound themselves to serve the king in war, to appear at his court when required, to assist at his tribunals, and to be subject to his jurisdiction. After the oath, which was taken while the vassal held his hands within those of his liege lord, the bishops-elect received their investiture of the temporalities of the Church.[1] The transfer of the *ring* and

---

[1] It is not certain when bishops were first required to take the feudal oath. The bishops, assembled in the Synod of *Quiercy* (Crecy), in 858, protested against taking the oath to the German king, Louis, declaring that they could not, like laics, become the vassals of any man, and that it was not lawful for them, after their ordination, to place their consecrated hands upon a secular oath. Et nos episcopi, Domino consecrati, non sumus hujusmodi homines, ut sicut homines saeculares in Vassallatico debeamus nos cuilibet commendare, seu ad defensionem et adjutorium gubernationis in ecclesiastico regimine nos ecclesiasque nostras committere; aut jurationis sacramentum, quod nos evangelica et apostolica atque canonica auctoritas vetat, debeamus quoquo modo facere. Manus enim charismate sacro peruncta, quae de pane et vino aqua mixto per orationem et crucis signum conficit corpus Christi et sanguinis sacramentum, abominabile est, quidquid ante ordinationem fecerit, ut post ordinationem episcopatus saeculare tangat ullo modo sacramentum (*Harduin*, T. V., p. 475). Though not certain, it is very probable, that Bishop *Hincmar* of Laon took such an oath, or

crosier, the symbols of episcopal power and dignity, was a circumstance which rendered this ceremony of investiture still more significant and perilous.[1]

It was absolutely necessary for the Church to liberate herself from this degrading servitude, and no sooner was she in a position to make the attempt than all her efforts were directed to this end. In the first year of the pontificate of Leo IX., there was a decree passed in the Synod of Rheims (A. D. 1049), enacting that, for the future, no one should be permitted to receive episcopal consecration *who had not first been elected by the clergy and the people.*[2]

It is a consolation to know that, even in these evil days, when the Church was oppressed and in a state of dependence, there were still those who were courageous and bold enough to utter a protest against the encroachments of the civil power, and to remind princes of the words of Charlemagne. "*I am,*" said he, "*but the defender and dutiful servant of the Church.*" "There is," says the Council of St. Macra (A. D. 881), "a wide distinction between the sacerdotal and the

---

homagium, to King Charles the Bald, to whom he promised fidelity, "*sicut homo suo seniori.*"

[1] Even Clovis had said (Diplom. an. 508): "Quidquid est fisci nostri per annulum tradimus." (In *Bouquet*, T. IV., p. 616.)

Of Clovis II. (A. D. 623), it is said in Vita S. Romani Eppi. Rothomag.: "Baculum illi contulit pastoralem."

In Germany, kings claimed the right of nominating to bishoprics in virtue of *foundations*, *endowments*, *extensive grants*, and *privileges*, for which the *episcopal sees* were wholly indebted to the munificence and liberality of either them or *their predecessors*. For this reason, even when it happened that the king did not appoint, the representatives of the clergy and of the lay vassals brought the *ring and crosier of the deceased bishop* to him, and requested him to confirm the election. Not unfrequently the king was directly asked to nominate a bishop. The ring and crosier were first employed in the tenth century as the distinctive symbols of episcopal investiture, their use being analogous to that of the sword and lance in the creation of civil or military functionaries. (*Nat. Alex.* Hist. Eccl. saec., XI. et XII., diss. IV.)

[2] *Conc. Remense.*, can. I.-III.: Ne quis sine electione cleri et populi ad regimen ecclesiasticum proveheretur. — Ne quis sacros ordines, aut ministeria ecclesiastica vel altaria emeret aut venderet. — Et si quis Clericorum emisset, id cum digna satisfactione suo Episcopo redderet. — Ne quis laicorum ecclesiasticum ministerium vel altaria teneret, nec episcoporum quibus consentirent. (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 741. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1006.)

royal power.[1] The dignity of bishops is superior to that of kings, inasmuch as bishops anoint kings and answer for their conduct before God." Of course, a complete *separation* of Church and State, under the then existing constitution of the of the Christian States of Germany, would have been impossible; nor was anything of this character contemplated by the council. And, in matter of fact, the bishops exercised a very great, and, at times, decisive and sovereign, influence in the most important secular affairs; as, for example, when there was question of the right of succession.

Again, the *coronation of kings*[2] deeply impressed the minds of the people with the importance of those to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony. Theodosius the Younger was the first instance, in the East Roman Empire, of royal

---

[1] Cap. I., in *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 538. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 350 sq.; likewise, *Conc. Troslejan.*, a. 909, cap. II., in *Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 267. *Harduin*, l. c., p. 507. Constant reference was made to the words of Pope Gelasius, Vol. I., p. 650, note 1. It is a very significant fact, that Archbishop *Hincmar* of Rheims, who, while acknowledging and defending the *relative independence of Church and State* within their respective spheres of action, *maintained the spiritual superiority of the ecclesiastical over the civil power.*

[2] The sixth Council of Paris, addressing kings, uses the following forcible language: "Rex a recte agendo vocatur. Si enim pie et juste et misericorditer regit, merito rex appellatur: si his caruerit, non rex, sed tyrannus est. Antiqui autem omnes reges tyrannos vocabant: sed postea pie et juste et misericorditer regentes regis nomen sunt adepti: impie vero, injuste crudeliterque principantibus non regis, sed tyrannicum aptatum est nomen. — Regale ministerium specialiter est populum Dei gubernare, et regere cum aequitate et justitia, et ut pacem et concordiam habeant studere. Ipse enim debet primo defensor esse ecclesiarum et servorum Dei, viduarum, orphanorum caeterorumque pauperum, nec non et omnium indigentium.' (*Mansi*, T. XIV., pp. 574, 577. *Harduin*, T. IV., pp. 1332, 1334.)

After Lothaire had been deposed by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (A. D. 842), the bishops refused to give his brothers possession of his realm until they had promised to rule *according to the will of God*, and not arbitrarily, as their brother had done. "Verumtamen," says Nithard, "haudquaquam illis hanc licentiam dedere (regendi regni), donec palam illos percontati sunt, utrum illud *per vestigia fratris ejecti, an secundum Dei voluntatem regere voluissent.* Respondentibus autem, in quantum nosse ac posse Deus illis concederet, secundum suam voluntatem, se et suos gubernare et regere velle, ajunt: *Et auctoritate divina, et illud suscipiatis, et secundum Dei voluntatem illud regatis*, monemus, hortamur atque praecipimus." Cf. also *Höfler*, The German Popes, Pt. II., p. 327. A later formulary of coronation contains the following words: "Bene est ut te prius de onere, ad quod destinaris, moneamus. Regiam hodie suscipis coronation by a bishop, and in the Germano-Christian States, the Visigoth kings of Spain, Wamba and Ervig.[1] Before receiving the crown, the king made a profession of Catholic faith, and promised to defend the rights of the Church and maintain her liberties, after which the bishop transferred to him the sword, the crown, and the scepter, the symbols of royal authority, explaining the symbolical meaning of each in turn, and exhorting the recipient to faithfully perform the duties which they implied. Thus, for example, Eugene II., in speaking of this matter, warns Christian princes not to draw the sword against each other, but to use it only against barbarous nations and against the Saracens and Normans. In France, the right of anointing kings was confined to the Archbishop of Rheims, and in Germany to one of the Rhenish archbishops. It was not long before the custom of anointing queens was introduced. The first to receive this distinction were *Irmentrude*, the queen of Charles the Bald (A. D. 866), and *Judith*, his daughter, who had married the Anglo-Saxon king Ethelwolf (A. D. 856).

§ 193. *Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Popes.*

At no time in the previous history of the Church was more ecclesiastical authority concentrated in the Supreme Head at Rome, and at no time were the bishops more free in the exercise of theirs. The latter was a consequence of the former, for the greater the authority of the Pope, the more ready and able he is to protect the rights of bishops. Thus, for example, *Ariald* and *Landulf* would have had no chance of achieving a victory in their conflict against the immoral priests of Milan, had they not maintained intimate relations with the Holy See. Wherever the authority of the Holy See did not

---

dignitatem, praeclarum sane inter mortales locum, sed discriminis, laboris et anxietatis plenum. Verum si consideraveris, quod omnis potestas e domino Deo est, per quem reges regnant, tu quoque de grege tibi commisso ipsi Deo rationem es redditurus." See *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 68.

[1] Conf. *Conc. Toletan.* XII., a. 681, cap. I.: Etenim sub qua pace vel ordine serenissimus Ervigius princeps regni conscenderit culmen, regnandique per sacrosanctam unctionem susceperit potestatem, etc. *Harduin*, T. III., p. 1718.

reach, and its influence was not felt, morals decayed and discipline relaxed.

That the authority of the Popes, in itself intrinsically necessary and required to meet the wants of the people, and which increased and became more and more a blessing to the Church as time went on, was in truth supreme, is established by the following facts: 1. The Popes promulgated general laws in ecclesiastical government and discipline, and made them binding upon the universal Church.[1] Furthermore, it was conceded that these possessed this universal binding force by the fact that they were accepted as authoritative before they had been admitted into any of the more ancient and recognized collections of canon law, or into that of the *pseudo-Isidore*, or the Deacon of Mentz, or *Benedict the Levite*, or *Abbot Regino of Prüm*, or *Burkhard*, Bishop of Worms,[2] all of which were then in general use. 2. They exercised judiciary powers over bishops, notably when appeals were made to Rome. 3. They called bishops, particularly those of the Frankish Empire, to attend councils held *in Rome*—a usage derived from the patriarchs of an earlier age. 4. They established new dioceses and introduced changes into old ones. 5. They conferred the pallium and permitted the exercise of the metropolitan rights of which it was symbolical. 6. They frequently gave their definite approval to the resignations of bishops, although these might have been previously accepted in provincial councils. 7. They granted exceptional *privileges* to churches and monasteries.[3] 8. They sent *Vicars Apostolic*, clothed with extensive powers, on embassies to the bishops of various countries. A bishop of the country was frequently appointed to this dignity; but, later on, it was more common to send legates *extraordinary.* During and after the pontificate of Nicholas I., papal legates convoked and presided over *national councils.*

---

[1] *Conc. Pontigonense*, a. 876. Ut quoties utilitas ecclesiastica dictaverit, sive in evocanda synodo, sive in aliis negotiis exercendis, per Gallias et Germanias Apostolica vice fruatur, et decreta sedis Apostolicae per ipsum episcopis manifesta efficiantur: et rursus qua gesta fuerint ejus relatione, si necesse fuerit Apostolicae sedi pandantur, et majora negotia ac difficiliora quaeque suggestione ipsius a sede Apostolica disponenda et enucleanda quaerantur. *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 308. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 167. Cf. also *Stephani V.* decretum, in *Gratian.*, Pt. I., dist. XIX., c. 4.

[2] Cf. *Wasserschleben*, Hist. of the Sources of Law before Gratianus, Berlin, 1839.

[3] See a summary of such privileges granted by Pope Leo IX., in *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. II., p. 366.

This fullness of ecclesiastical authority was, if possible, still further increased by the respect which the people conceived for the Popes when they heard of them *crowning emperors*, and receiving, yearly, thousands of *pilgrims* at the Tomb of the Apostles. Every one regarded Rome as the capital of Christendom, whither princes and people flocked, and where devotion was kindled and crimes expiated.

The *coronation* of the Popes was the completion and seal of this external consideration, in which they were everywhere held.

§ 194. *The College of Cardinals.*

Thomassini Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina, Pt. I., lib. II., c. 113 sq. *Muratori*, de Cardin. Institutione (Antiq. Italiae medii aevi, T. IV., p. 152). *Onuphrii Panvini*, Liber de Cardin. Origine. (*Ang. Mai*, Spicileg. Rom., T. IX.) *Binterim*, Memorabilia, Vol. II., Pt. II. *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., p. 193-204, especially full details and conscientious research, in *Phillips*, Canon Law, Vol. VI., p. 65-296. ADDED BY THE TR.: *Tamagna*, Origine, e prerogative de' Cardinali, Pt. I., c. 3; *J. Devoti*, Instit. Canon., Romae, 1818, Vol. I., p. 186-199; *Ferrante*, Elem. J. C., Romae, 1854, p. 55-58.

The title of *Cardinal* (cardinales, *χαρδηνάλοι* or *χαρδηνάριοι*) was first applied in the eleventh century to the bishops immediately around Rome (episcopi collaterales Papae), who were in a sense of the Pope's diocese, and to the clergy of the Roman Church proper.[1] In early times, the title was applied to such of the clergy as had received permanent appointments to certain churches; but it was pre-eminently the designation of the ecclesiastics attached to cathedrals, because the bishop's church was regarded as the pivot on which all the others hinged (cardo). Hence, by the fact of belonging to the episcopal church or hinge (cardo) of the diocese, they were designated *cardinals.*

---

[1] Pope Leo IX. says, concerning the designation of cardo totius ecclesiae, transferred to the clergy of Rome, epist. ad Michaelem Cerularium, nro. 32: "Sicut cardine totum regitur ostium, ita Petro, et successoribus ejus totius ecclesiae disponitur emolumentum. . . . Unde clerici ejus cardinales dicuntur, cardini utique illi, quo caetera moventur, vicinius adhaerentes." (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 653. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 944.) Yet, as *Ferrante*, the Roman canonist, says in his Institutes, p. 55, they used to be called, from most ancient times, to assist with the Roman clergy at all deliberations of moment, and to form with the Roman priests the Pope's senate, yet their formal and definitive incorporation of the seven suburbicarian bishops with the S. College dates from the *eighth* century. (TR.)

The history of this title is analogous to that of Pope. For, as in the early days of the Church, all bishops were called *Papae,*[1] an appellation which, later on, was restricted to the Bishop of Rome, so also did the title of cardinal, originally applied to the canons of all cathedral chapters, become, little by little (and in proportion as their influence and authority increased), the special and distinctive designation of the cardinals *at Rome.*

It would, however, be a mistake to infer that the office of Roman cardinals underwent any change in the lapse of centuries. Although great and numerous changes may have been introduced as to the number, distinctions, prerogatives, privileges, and mode of creating them, their office has undergone no such modification, and is to-day precisely what it was in early times.

It is an undeniable fact, that their two most important prerogatives—viz., to elect Popes, and assist them by their counsel in the government of the Church—were exercised by them in the early ages, as well as at present. Even Pope Siricius, speaking in his seventh epistle of the condemnation of Jovinian and his associates, says that he gave the judgment by the advice of the Roman clergy (facto presbyterio). Hence, St. Bernard calls cardinals the counselors and coadjutors of the Roman Pontiff; and the Council of Trent prescribes that the Sacred College shall be composed of representatives from all

---

[1] Πάπας, or πάππας, a ὁ papa = πατηρ, father. Inscr. 2664. *Eust.* 565, 14, 15. Secondly. Papa, *father*, a title given to bishops in general, and to those of Alexandria and Rome in particular. *Orig.* I. 85 D.; II. 995 C. *Greg. Th.* 1020 A. *Dion. Alex.* apud *Euseb.* II. 648 C. *Arius* apud *Epiph.* II. 213 A. *Athanas.* I. 355 B., 369 A.; II. 708 D. *Basil.* IV., 540 B., 541 A., 952 A. *Hieron.* I., 754 (535). *Carth.* 1255 A. *Ephes.* 872 C. *Chron.* 516. *Nic. C. P.*, Histor. 7 14 = παπᾶς, priest. (Tr.)

Christian nations, thus constituting a kind of Western Synod, and that their qualifications shall be the same as those required by canons in bishops.

In the early days of the Church, the mode of electing Popes was similar to that followed in the case of bishops. The candidate was first settled upon by the concurrent voice of the general body of the Roman clergy, by the laity, and the neighboring bishops, after which the clergy and the bishops assembled alone, and either approved or rejected the choice made.

It is true that the cardinals did not exercise the exclusive right of electing Popes until the eleventh century, when Pope Nicholas II. (A. D. 1059) published a bull confining this duty to them, and allowing to the general body of the clergy only the privilege of approving their choice. But it is equally true that they then obtained by that bull only the formal confirmation of a right which they had always virtually exercised. Hence, from being invested with so high a prerogative, they were at all times much esteemed, and commanded the greatest consideration.

Although possessing no local jurisdiction, they gradually came to be considered as persons of more importance than even bishops and patriarchs. Nor need this excite surprise. The same principle runs through political society also; for those who have the choosing of a supreme ruler, and are ministers of State, are persons of greater consideration than the governors of cities and provinces situate within the same realm.[1]

The cardinals being princes of the Church, and next in dignity to the Pope himself, wore a dress and bore insignia corresponding to the character of their office. The red hat was given to them by Innocent IV., and was intended to remind them that they should at all times be ready to shed their blood, if necessary, in defense of the Church and her rights, and the scarlet cape, or "la sacra porpora," was added by Pope Paul II., in 1460.

In 1567, Pius V. forbade all clergymen who had not been created cardinals by the Pope to assume the title. Their official appellation of *Eminence* was conferred upon them by Urban VIII., A. D. 1630.

---

[1] Vide *Ferrante*, l. c. (TR.)

Cardinals are frequently sent on embassies by the Holy See, and, while engaged on such missions, are called Legates *a Latere*.

When the cardinals assemble to take counsel with the Pope on any matter of importance relating to either Church or State, such assembly is called a *Consistory* (consistorium).

The College of Cardinals consisted, in the twelfth century, of seven cardinal *bishops*, whose sees lay, and still lie, in the immediate neighborhood of Rome, and who were called on this account *episcopi suburbicarii*, and took their titles from the names of their episcopal sees—namely, *Ostia*, *Porto*, *Santa Rufina* (Silva Candida), *Albano*, *Sabina*, *Tusculum* (Frascati), *Praeneste* (Palestrina)—but Santa Rufina was afterward added to the bishopric of Porto; of twenty-eight (originally twelve) cardinal-*priests*, who held titular churches within the city of Rome; and of eighteen cardinal-*deacons*. The number of these last, at first only seven, was afterward raised to eighteen, fourteen of whom were called Deacons of the City, and four Deacons of the Palace—one of the duties of the latter being to assist the Pope when he officiates at the Church of St. John Lateran.

In the year 1586, Sixtus V. fixed the number of the College of Cardinals at seventy, of whom six were cardinal-bishops (suburbicarii), fifty cardinal priests, and fourteen cardinal-deacons. This arrangement has remained unchanged in any particular down to our own day, although the college has rarely, if ever, its full complement of members, as the Pope always leaves some vacancies, which may be filled under extraordinary circumstances, and it has not unfrequently happened that the number has been very much below seventy.

As the cardinal-bishops were obliged, besides taking part in all important deliberations, to officiate, each in his turn, for a week together (hebdomadarii), at the Lateran Church, they became gradually identified with the Roman clergy.

The Cardinal-bishop of *Ostia*, whose see has been united to that of Velletri, has always retained the privilege of consecrating the Pope-elect, having as his assistants the bishops of Porto and Albano.

§ 195. *Metropolitans, Bishops, and Their Dioceses.*

Thomassini Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina, Pt. I., lib. I., c. 43, 56 (de Metropolit. et Episc.); Pt. I., lib. II., c. 5 sq. (de Archipresbyteris.)

Through the efforts of St. Boniface[1] and Pepin, the *power of metropolitans* had long since been considerably increased. This may also be shown from the work of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, entitled "*De Jure Metropolitanorum*," and from a letter addressed to his cousin, Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, in which their prerogatives are enumerated.[2] As there was danger of powers so extensive becoming detrimental to the true interests of the Church, when placed in the hands of ambitious prelates, the Pope interposed, either directly or through his legates, to check this exercise of them. He at first limited their extension by his own direct legislation as Head of the Church, but, later on, obliged the metropolitans to conform to the requirements of ecclesiastical law, as set forth in the pseudo-Isidorian decretals. Owing to their exalted rank, the metropolitans still retained many of their political rights, while they lost, in a great measure, the excessive *ecclesiastical* jurisdiction which they had been in the habit of exercising over their suffragan bishops. Instead of holding *provincial synods* at stated times, and establishing their authority on the basis of law, they attempted, during the course of the tenth century, to govern the dioceses of their provinces directly and by a sort of personal jurisdiction, and thus excited the enmity and opposition of bishops and provoked the interference of popes.

---

[1] Vide § 163.

[2] *Dr. Döllinger*, in referring to this same letter, thus summarizes its contents: "The metropolitan examined, confirmed, and consecrated the bishops of his province; he summoned them to synods, at which each one was bound to appear; to him were to be referred all complaints against a bishop, and all disputes of the bishops among themselves; he appointed administrators of churches that had lost their bishops; no bishop could appeal to Rome against the will of the metropolitan, nor, without his permission, travel beyond the province, send messengers, or alienate the goods of his church. Upon the archbishops devolved the care of the entire province; in all ecclesiastical affairs he could be consulted; to him appeals might be made from the judgment of the bishop, and he was empowered, even without convening a synod, of his own authority, to correct the errors or the crimes of a bishop." Ch. Hist., Cox's Eng. trans., Vol. III. pp. 180, 181. (Tr.)

By entering into close relations with the Head of the Church and submitting fully to his authority, the *bishops* acquired at once a greater influence among the bulk of the people, and greater freedom from the restraints of princes. Their relations to the clergy of their several dioceses remained unchanged. If a priest chanced to be removed without sufficient cause, he might appeal from the action of the bishop to the judgment of either a provincial synod, the metropolitan, or the Pope.

The right of the bishop to appoint to all ecclesiastical positions in his diocese was limited by the privileges of *patronage*[1] legally acquired by laymen who had founded churches or benefices.[2] But, still worse, many of the patrons, who had succeeded in getting possession, either by force or royal grant, of nearly all the churches of some districts, so far transgressed their rights as to arbitrarily depose ecclesiastics and appropriate to their own use the tithes and the offerings of the faithful. Again, the great increase in the number of private chapels and oratories gave rise to a class of priests, who, living constantly either at the courts of princes or in the palaces of the nobles, were withdrawn from the watchful care of the bishop, to the great detriment of episcopal authority and ecclesiastical discipline. The great lords claimed, strangely enough, that these ecclesiastics formed part of their household (de familia domini), and accordingly had them engaged in worldly pursuits, and sometimes employed in the most menial services, such as waiting at table, grooming horses, and caring hounds. On the other hand, these ecclesiastics, feeling that their position gave them a certain security from punishment, ceased to trouble themselves about episcopal authority, and led most disgraceful lives.

---

[1] Right of presentation to a church *or* ecclesiastical benefice. (Tr.) The synods of Orleans, 541 (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1437); Toledo, 655 (*Harduin*, T. III., p 973 sq.); then, a capitulary of 816, already grant privileges of this kind.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 663.

But the Church would not consent to quietly submit to the assumption of the seigneurs, or to relinquish her authority over ecclesiastics. She pertinaciously insisted that these latter were of her own household (de familia ecclesiae), and should order their lives according to her laws.

Still another great evil of these times was what were called *ordinationes absolutae*, or the ordaining of ecclesiastics without previously appointing them to serve at any particular church—an exceptional practice first introduced in favor of such priests as were going into missionary countries. It was not long before complaints were brought forward, in several councils, of the great number of such priests, who were going about, exempt, apparently, from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction (acephali, clerici vagantes).

In spite of all former[1] and present[2] efforts to suppress the class of ecclesiastics known as *chorepiscopi*, or rural bishops, there still existed quite a number of them, who were generally employed by bishops as vicars or auxiliaries, were sometimes independent in the exercise of their functions, and were not unfrequently set over vacant sees by kings who were desirous of retaining the revenues. They disappeared almost entirely, during the course of the tenth century, and were replaced by bishops-vicar, or, as they are now called, *coadjutor bishops* (vicarii in pontificalibus). According to *Binterim*, the first instance of this class is one *Leo*, who is mentioned in a letter of Pope John XV. as "vice-episcopus St. Treverensis ecclesiae."[3] They were *subsequently* consecrated under the title of a diocese, which, although actually in the hands of infidels, was still cherished in the memory of the Church, and on this account they were called *episcopi in partibus* (sc. infidelium), or *episcopi titulares*. The cathedral

---

[1] See p. 138.

[2] *Weizsäcker*, The Struggle against the Chorepiscopacy of the Frankish Empire, in the Ninth Century, Tübg. 1859. Cf. *Walter's* C. L., 13th ed., p. 336, note 8.

[3] *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 384. On the other hand, the ecclesiastic sent, in 1036, by Pope Benedict IX. to Archbishop Poppo, was, properly speaking, a *coadjutor*. Conf. *Holzer*, de Proepiscopis Trevirensibus, who demonstrates that the existence in the diocese of Treves of the *institution* of vice-bishops, before the twelfth century, can not be proved.

canons, who, up to the present time, had led a *community life*,[1] formed the bishop's council, and assisted him by their advice in affairs of moment, began now to feel this quasi-monastic discipline growing irksome. Not content with the distribution of the property ordered by Günther, Archbishop of Cologne (A. D. 873), into foundations for *cathedral* and *collegiate chapters*, under one of which two heads the canons might class themselves, according as they had belonged to cathedral or other churches,[2] they insisted, in the tenth century, that such a division should be made as would secure to each his individual revenue or prebend. It was in vain that good, holy bishops exerted themselves to prevent this division and restore the ancient mode of canonical life. Their efforts being but poorly seconded, their only effect was to beget a protracted struggle between the two parties of the canons, secular and regular (canonici saeculares et regulares).[3]

Two circumstances at this time contributed to secure a greater freedom of action to cathedral canons, and to increase their influence in the administration of the diocese; for while, on the one hand, the right of electing bishops was vested in them, on the other, the bishops were so mixed up in secular affairs that they omitted holding *diocesan synods* and *synodal*

---

[1] See p. 161.

[2] *Concil. Colon.*, anno 873, in *Mansi*, T. XVII., p. 275. *Harduin*, T. IV., Pt. I., p. 137.

[3] Complaints on the decay of canonical life, in *Yves*, Bishop of Chartres (about 1092), epist. 215: Quod vero communis vita in omnibus Ecclesiis pene defecit, tam civilibus quam dioecesanis, nec auctoritati, sed desuetudini et defectui adscribendum est, refrigescente charitate, quae omnia vult habere communia, et regnante cupiditate, quae non quaerit ea, quae Dei sunt et proximi, sed tantum quae sunt propria. See, likewise, *Trithem.* Chronic. Hirsaug. ad a. 975, on the canons of Treves: Canonici majoris eccl. St. Petri Trevirorum, qui sub certa regula in communi usque in hoc tempus vixerunt, abjecta pristinae conversationis norma desierunt esse regulares, distributionibus inter se factis praebendarum: et qui prius more Apostolorum omnia habuere communia, coeperunt jam deinceps singuli possidere propria. Quorum exemplum secuti plures Canonici in Wormatia et Spira, quod ideo fieri potuit, quia in multis temporibus multa mutantur. The ineffectual attempts at reëstablishing it, *Conc. Rom.*, a. 1059, can. IV., and *Conc. Rom.*, a. 1063, c. 4, in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., pp. 1062, 1139. *Mansi*, T. XIX., pp. 908, 1025. Cf. *Thomassini* l. c., Pt. I., lib. III., c. 11; Pt. III., lib. II., c. 23, nro. 2. *Höfler*, l. c., Pt. II., p. 308 sq.

courts, which they were obliged by the canons to convoke annually.[1]

During and after the lifetime of Heddo, Archbishop of Strasburg, many dioceses were divided into several archdeaconries, presided over by an equal number of *archdeacons*,[2] who could not be deprived of their office except by canonical sentence. They possessed great influence in the administration of the diocese, and, in case of a vacancy, took the direction of affairs into their own hands.[3] The *Great Archdeacon* (archidiaconus magnus) of the cathedral, who was usually the *Dean* (praepositus) of the canons, frequently formed with the other archdeacons of the diocese, or rural archdeacons, a chapter or college, which by degrees acquired, in its collective capacity, an *ordinary* (propria, ordinaria) and extensive jurisdiction, while its several members, now, as formerly, the representatives of the bishop, enjoyed singly only a delegated authority (jurisdictio delegata).

Subordinate to the archdeaconries were the so-called rural chapters, over which *archpriests* or *deans* presided, and the establishment of which was frequently pressed upon the bishops as a duty.

In order to kindle and keep alive the zeal of the clergy in the great work of saving souls, *pastoral conferences* were established, under the name of "*Calendae*"—so called because they were held on the first day of every month, except when that happened to be a Sunday or holy day.[1] The calendae were at first intended to supply the place of provincial and diocesan synods, which had now ceased to be held. In some countries the bishops prescribed the holding of them as early as the ninth century, and, from this time onward, they continued to be pretty well kept up until the thirteenth, after which we hear no more of them until the time of St. Charles Borromeo.

---

[1] The ordinances of *St. Boniface* on this head are numerous, and adapted to almost every exigency. Ep. 105: Statuimus, ut per annos singulos unusquisque presbyter episcopo suo in quadragesima rationem ministerii sui reddat, sive de fide catholica, sive de baptismo, sive de omni ordine ministerii sui. — Et moneat metropolitanus, ut episcopi a synodo venientes in propria parochia cum presbyteris et abbatibus conventum habentes, praecepta synodi servare insinuando praecipiant. This ordinance was incorporated into the Capitularies of the Frankish kings. According to later ordinances, the diocesan synod was to be held even *twice* a year, but this was seldom carried into effect. For a thorough knowledge of this institution, originating in that age, it is highly important to read the admonitio, or sermo synodalis, qui in singulis Synodis parochianis presbyteris annuntiandus est, which is ascribed to various authors. See in *Harduin*, Coll. Concil., T. VI., Pt. I., p. 873–879; in *Mansi* and *Höfler*, p. 471. Cf. *Phillips*, The Diocesan Synod, p. 44–62.

[2] See p. 137.

[3] Cf. *Thomassini* l. c., Pt. I., lib. II., c. 19 and 20. *Planck*, Constitution of Christian Society, Vol. III., p. 708 sq. *Pertsch*, Origin of Archdeacons, Hildesheim, 1743. *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 386 sq. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cycl., Vol. I., p. 405 sq.; French transl., Vol. I., p. 503.

It was the duty of the archpriest or dean to call the priests together, and to indicate the place of meeting, which was always the residence of some one of those composing the rural chapter. Each member had a right to speak on the subject brought before the chapter, and to vote for or against the acceptance of any measure. The subject to be submitted was selected by the bishop, and, after action had been taken, sent back to him for final judgment.

No priests except such as had the care of souls, whether secular or religious, were admitted into these conferences; and should any one of those whose duty it was to be present absent himself without a valid reason, he was condemned to pay a fine.

But, notwithstanding the undoubted utility which priests derived from coming together in these conferences, and discussing practical issues and solving knotty questions, it was found next to impossible to keep them up regularly, or to have them frequent enough to do any considerable good. Bishops endeavored to force attendance, first by admonitions, and then by penalties, but with indifferent success; and were at last obliged to limit the number of yearly conferences to three, then to two, and finally to one, which was equivalent to discontinuing them entirely.

---

[1] Conf. *Binterim*, Diocesan Synods, p. 101–108. Such conferences, according to *Thomassini*, Pt. II., lib. III., c. 74; *Regino*, lib. I., c. 216; *Harduin*, T. VI., p. 420; Acta Concil. Mediolan., and other authorities, were prescribed at various times. Thus, by Charlemagne, in his Capitularies; by Herardus, Bp. of Tours; Hincmar, Abp. of Rheims; Riculf, Bp. of Sitten; Ulrich, Bp. of Augsburg; Atto, Bp. of Vercelli; in England, by the Council of Exeter (1131), and of London (1237). *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclop., art. Conference, Fr. trans., Vol. V., p. 152. (Tr.)

What the circumstances were which conspired to interfere with the holding of these conferences, it is not to our purpose to inquire; but probably a sufficient one may be supplied by the fact that, while they are desirable and may be made useful, they are not *absolutely* necessary, and have never been prescribed either by a *general* council or a papal decree. Moreover, unlike any other institution of general acceptance in the Church, they came into existence, not in a regular order of development, but, as it were, fortuitously, at certain times and in particular countries. At first, they were held in some of the districts of France, Germany, and England; later on, in Italy and Belgium; and at the present day, in Ireland. They are, then, more dependent on fortuitous circumstances, and on the action of individuals, than upon any great principle and recognized law. It is, however, very true that their introduction is usually preceded by a decay of morals, laxity of discipline, and neglect of study among the clergy; and, though not absolutely and universally necessary, they may be very useful under certain circumstances and in given localities. But of their utility or necessity the bishops are the judges.

Parish rights were not defined before the middle of the eleventh century, and then only in episcopal cities.[1] Popes *Eugene II.* (A. D. 826) and *John IX.* (A. D. 904) issued ordinances forbidding bishops to apply to their own use any of the land or other immovable property belonging to the estates of the Church.[2]

§ 196. *Church Property.*

Thomassini Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip., Pt. III., lib. I., c. 7, 14, 22, 28, and 29.

Piety has always been the motive which has inspired Christians to give generously to the Church, whether in the form of donations or bequests, and has consequently been the unfailing source of her wealth. This was abundantly exemplified toward the close of the tenth century, when Christians were anticipating the end of the world, getting rid of their property, and making pilgrimages to the Holy Land. The most extensive of the possessions of the Church were held in fief, but those which did her most honor were the desert lands that had been reclaimed by the energy and the toil of her monks. People soon began to cry out that the Church was growing excessively wealthy, and to these the Synod of Paris (A. D. 829) replied that "she could never come into possession of too *much* property if she administered it well and put it to proper use." Moreover, people were willing to see wealth in possession of an institution which distributed the proceeds of it with such prodigality among the poor. Henceforth the *tithes*, which had long since legally belonged to the Church, were regularly paid, and a synod held in the year 909 wished to impose their payment upon *every branch* of *industry*.

---

[1] The *Council of Limoges*, in the year 1031, decides, in spite of the opposition of the canons of cathedrals, that baptism and preaching may be performed in these city parishes. See *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 836 sq.; *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 543.

[2] *Eugene*, at the Synod of Rome, can. 16, and *John*, at a Synod of Ravenna, can. 10.

The *Jura Stolae*, as they are called, belonged to the priests. As every ecclesiastical function is of itself absolutely free and gratuitous, the "*perquisites*" were always regarded as *voluntary gifts*.

The Church has, in every age, looked with suspicion upon the practice of accepting *State grants to pay her clergy*, inasmuch as it impairs her dignity and jeopardizes her liberty. Although the Church had always claimed and the State always granted the exemption of ecclesiastical property from taxation, still both Church and clergy were at times heavily burdened. Men of coarse instincts and violent tempers, disregarding every legal restriction, plundered her property, and, sheltering themselves under the iniquitous and barbarous usage known as the *right of spoliation* (*jus spolii seu jus rapite capite*), not unfrequently made attempts upon the lives of clergymen in order to come at their possessions.[1]

---

[1] *Bonn*, Philosophical and Theological *Revue*, nros. 23–25, in "Scientific Discussions."

§ 197. *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction—Immunities of the Clergy.*

Following the precedent of the Roman emperors,[1] Charlemagne and Louis the Mild permitted the bishops to exercise considerable jurisdiction in such matters as marriages, last wills, oaths, usury, and the like. When necessary, they were authorized to call upon the nobles of the empire to assist them in bringing before their tribunals sinners who had been condemned to public penance. They alone had authority to try and pass judgment upon ecclesiastics. In extreme cases, clergymen were sentenced to imprisonment for life in some monastery. It seldom happened that they were deprived of their dignity and handed over to the secular authority.

Hincmar of Rheims,[2] though a warm defender of the privileges and *immunities* of ecclesiastics, still held, that, in litigation with laics in suits involving real estate, they should send persons to represent them in the secular courts. If the accused were a bishop, he had the privilege of being tried by a court of bishops—a privilege conceded by princes, even when the charges brought forward were of a purely political nature; such, for example, as high treason.

It would also seem that this was the court of judicature, where charges were made by a bishop against a prince.

---

[1] See p. 127.

[2] *Hincmar* wrote a special treatise on this subject when his cousin, the Bishop of Laon, who had been deprived of the temporalities of his see by Charles the Bald, refused to appear before the King's court.

CHAPTER IV.

RELIGIOUS LIFE—WORSHIP—DISCIPLINE.

Ratherii Veronensis de Contemptu Canonum; Discordia inter ipsum et clericos; Apologia sui ipsius; Itinerarium et epist. (opp. ed. *Ballerini*, Veron. 1765, fol. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 136; also in *d'Achéry*, Spicilegium, T. I. *Atto Vercellensis*, de Pressuris Ecclesiasticis, libb. VIII., and epist. *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I. *Petri Damiani* epist., libri VIII. Of special importance for this are the written instructions on the life of priests and laics, from the time of Pope Gregory V., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 174–199; in German, in *Höfler's* German Popes, Vol. I., p. 185–195.

§ 198. *The Morals of the Clergy.*

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt lose its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? Matt. v. 13.

The bishops of this period were more concerned in maintaining their position as *secular princes* than in saving souls and looking after the interests of the Church over which they were set. It was not an unusual thing for them to wield the sword in the contests of factions.

In proportion as the empire declined and wars multiplied, the lower clergy grew daily more dissolute. Their total disregard of discipline and depravity of morals were unprecedented in any former age of the Church; and their ignorance was such that the questions which they were required to answer, before being permitted to go up for orders, were of the most elementary character.[1] Was it possible for *such* a clergy to exert any influence for good upon the people? But it was not until the latter half of the tenth century that the clergy reached the lowest depth of degradation. *Unchastity* and *simony* were the prevailing vices. In many places the rule of celibacy was wholly ignored, and so great was the extent of the evil, and so deep the disgrace which attached to ecclesiastics, that those of them who lived an honorable married life were accounted virtuous, and dreaded either to give their own daughters in marriage to clergymen, or to permit their sons to take orders and become their successors. Although the condition of the clergy, when taken at its best, was bad enough, it is also true that the accounts that have come down are a trifle overdrawn, and of *too general a character* to command full credence when the charges are so grave. But if some of the clergy were stained with the vices, others were adorned with the virtues of their age; for, if a large class of them had not lived virtuous and holy lives, it would be impossible to account for the fact that they steadily grew in the esteem and reverence of the people. For what could insure the good opinion of others in their regard, if it were not fidelity to the virtues of their state? The zealous, but at times imprudent, *Ratherius* of Verona lifted up his voice, in the tenth century, to vindicate the honor of the priesthood. When dying, he composed this characteristic epitaph for himself: "Wayfarer, trample under foot the salt which has lost its savor." The efforts of *Atto*, Bishop of Vercelli († C. A. D.

---

[1] *Ratherius*—who, however, is more or less given to the use of harsh language—when speaking of these times, says in his *Itinerarium:* "Sciscitatus itaque de fide illorum (Clericorum Veronensium) inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere symbolum, quod fuisse creditur Apostolorum. Hac occasione Synodicam scribere omnibus Presbyteris sum compulsus," etc. In this Synodica, it is said, among other things: "Ipsam fidem — trifarie parare memoriae festinetis h. e. secundum symbolum — Apostolorum — et illam, quae ad Missam canitur, et illam S. Athanasii, quae ita incipit: 'Quicumque vult salvus esse.' Quicumque vult ergo Sacerdos in nostra parochia esse, aut fieri, aut permanere, illa, fratres, memoriter nobis recitet, cum proximo a nobis huc vocatus fuerit. — Moneo et

---

jam vos de die dominica ut cogitetis, aut si cogitare nescitis, interrogetis, quare ita vocetur. — Ut unusquisque vestrum, si fieri potest, expositionem Symboli et orationis Dominicae juxta traditionem Orthodoxorum penes se scriptam habeat, et eam pleniter intelligat, et inde, si novit, praedicando populum sibi commissum sedulo instruat; si non, saltem teneat vel credat. Orationes Missae et Canonem bene intelligat, et si non, saltem memoriter ac distincte proferre valeat: Epistolam et Evangelium bene legere possit, et utinam saltem ad litteram ejus sensum posset manifestare," etc. (*D'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., pp. 381, 376 and 378.)

We may obtain a more accurate knowledge of the degree of learning among the clergy, at the *beginning* of the latter half of the present epoch, from *Hetti*, Archbishop of Treves (A. D. 820–847), *Ιντηρρογατιωνες* quas suis proposuit auditoribus (an unpublished manuscript belonging to the monastery of St. Maximin, at Treves), from which it appears that clerics were made to undergo a close and thorough examination, not only on the *Pater Noster* and *Credo*, but also on the mystery of the *Trinity*.

960), and of *Dunstan*, Archbishop of Canterbury (A. D. 990), to have their clergy observe the rule of celibacy, were more prudent and moderate, and, on this account, much more successful. The clergy, and even the secular power itself, yielded to the firm and inflexible will and authority of Dunstan.

When, in the eleventh century, beginning with Pope *Leo IX.* (A. D. 1048), papal elections ceased to be under the restraints of secular interference, and men of austere morals, chastened zeal, and prudent solicitude for the true interests of the Church ascended the chair of St. Peter, the clergy, finding no encouragement for their evil-doing in the lives of the Popes, commenced to reform their own and regain something of the honor they had lost. In restoring the dignity and maintaining the holiness of the priesthood,[1] *Peter Damian*, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, and Deacon *Hildebrand* played a conspicuous part, laboring unceasingly, and at times having recourse to unusual means to effect their purpose. Their efforts were ably seconded by the *Patarian* Confederation in Upper Italy.

The zeal of Damian was at times not entirely under control, and, yielding to its promptings, he wrote a manifestly *exaggerated* account of the state of morality among the clergy, which Alexander II. suppressed, because he believed that its publication would do more harm than good.

The result of the labors of these champions of the faith, supplemented by those of the *monastic orders*, which had a large share in the work of clerical reformation, began to appear in the revival of spiritual life among the clergy, of which there were now many tokens.

§ 199. *Religious Orders of this Epoch.* Cf. §§ 142 and 168.

Bibliotheca Cluniacensis in qua SS. PP. abbatum vitae, miracula, scripta rec., cura *M. Marrier* et *Andr. Quercetani*, Par. 1614, fol. Ordo Clun., written in the eleventh century (Vet. discipl. monastica, ed. *Herrgott.*, Par. 1726, p. 133). Antiquiores consuett. Clun. monast., libb. III., by *Ulricus Cluniacens.*, written for Hirsau, 1070 (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 641–703). The vitae *Bernon.*, *Odon.*, *Odilon.*, *Romualdi*, by *Peter Damian*, *Joan. Gualberti* (*Mabillon*, Acta SS. Ord. St. Bened. saec. V., T. I.) †*Lorrain*, Essai historique sur l'abbaye de

---

[1] See § 190.

Clugny, Dijon, 1839; Germ. ed., Tübg. 1857. Vita *S. Wilhelmi*, Constt. Hirsaug. (*Herrgott*. l. c., p. 375.) *Hélyot*, Hist. des Couvents et des Ordres de Chevalerie, T. V. *Henrion*, Hist. des Ordres Religieux.

In convents of both men and women, there had also been a relaxation of discipline during this epoch, but it was quickly checked, and the severity of monastic life restored. By a decree of a council of the year 742, the Rule of St. Benedict was made obligatory upon all the monasteries of the Frankish Empire. Boniface, by his zeal and labors, greatly increased the number of cloisters, over which he watched with assiduous care—always on the alert to preserve the integrity of discipline, and to restore it where it had become relaxed. To this holy bishop did the great monasteries of *Fulda*, *Hersfeld*,[1] and others in Germany, owe their origin. These were important as centers of ecclesiastical training and general culture; but scarcely less so were those of *St. Gall*, *Reichenau*, *St. Blaise* in the Black Forest, *Rheinau* on an island of the Rhine below Schaffhausen, *Prüm* in the diocese of Treves; and, still later on, those of *Corvey* in Saxony, *Tegernsee* in Bavaria, and many others. But, unfortunately, excessive wealth, exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, and the government of lay abbots, brought on the usual results, and these monasteries, whose members had at one time been distinguished for their observance of rule, their piety, and their learning, became prominent for their absence of discipline and disregard of the moral law. The zealous and holy *Benedict of Aniane* († A. D. 821), with the co-operation of Louis the Mild, set about reforming his monks, and, in a short time, made them models of order and piety for the whole Frankish Empire.[2] Religious life and letters owe much to this revival of the Benedictine order by a reformer bearing the name of the illustrious founder; but, unfortunately, the reforms thus auspiciously begun were not generally taken up, nor did they exert any permanent influence. Again, while, on the one hand, little attention was paid to the decrees of the Council of Rome (A. D. 827) prohibiting the election of lay abbots, on the other, the monks were dispersed and their monasteries pillaged during the disorders consequent upon the strife of parties within the Frankish Empire, and the attacks of the Normans on the western, and of the Hungarians on the eastern frontiers; and, when they again returned to their former mode of life, they brought with them the spirit and vicious habits of men of the world, and could not, without difficulty, bring themselves to give up the opportunities and means of enjoyment which their great wealth placed within their reach, and live in the spirit of their vow of poverty. The accounts furnished us by the councils of *Metz* and *Trosly* (A. D. 909), of the life led by the monks of this time, are startling.[1]

---

[1] See § 168.

[2] The complete rule, explained in *Mabill.* ann. Bened., T. II., p. 435. *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 394 sq. *Benedict. Anian.* Codex Regularum (of the East and West) and Concordia Regularum, in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 103. Conf. †*Nicolai*, St. Benedict, Founder of *Aniane*, and *Cornelimünster* (Inda, near Aix-la-Chapelle) Cologne, 1865.

But in the midst of so much that was distressing, there were not wanting tokens of better things. Through the zeal and the labors of William of Aquitaine, a monk of the *Abbey of Clugny*, in the diocese of Mâcon, spiritual life began to revive, and it became evident that the liberty of the Church,[2] though delayed for a time, would eventually be obtained. The splendid reputation of this abbey was, in great measure, owing to the exertions of the pious *Berno* (A. D. 910), its first abbot.

---

[1] Capit. III.: De monasteriorum vero non statu, sed lapsu quid dicere vel agere debeamus, jam pene ambigimus. Dum enim mole criminum exigente, et judicium a domo Domini incipiente, quaedam a Paganis succensa vel destructa, quaedam rebus spoliata et ad nihilum prope sint redacta, si tamen quorumdam adhuc videntur superesse vestigia, nulla in eis regularis formae servantur instituta. Sive namque monachorum seu canonicorum seu sint sanctimonialium, propriis et sibi jure competentibus carent rectoribus, et dum contra omnem ecclesiae auctoritatem praelatis utuntur extraneis, in eis degentes partim indigentia, partim malevolentia, maximeque inhabilium sibi praepositorum faciente inconvenientia, moribus vivunt incompositis; et qui sanctitati religionique caelesti intenti esse debuerant, sui velut propositi immemores, terrenis negotiis vacant; quidam etiam, necessitate cogente, monasteriorum septa derelinquunt, et volentes nolentesque saecularibus juncti saecularia exercent, cum e contra dicat Apostolus: *Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis saecularibus.* (*Mansi*, T. XVIII., p. 270. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 510.)

[2] *Clarus*, William, Duke of Aquitaine, one of the great men of the world, and one of the Saints of the Church, Münster, 1864.

St. Odo, a man of still greater ability than *St. Berno*, his master in the spiritual life, and successor as abbot (A. D. 924–941), knew how to conciliate the good will of men, and governed his monastery with such firmness and prudence as to command the respect and elicit the admiration of all. Under *Aymar*, *Maiolus*, and particularly under *Odilo* (A. D. 994–1048), and *Hugh*, the successor to Odo, this asylum of holiness and learning went on steadily increasing in importance and influence till finally, toward the close of this epoch, there were to be found many monasteries even in *Spain* and far-off *Poland*, which recognized the jurisdiction of the *Abbot of Clugny*.

William, the worthy disciple of Maiolus, labored effectually for the reformation of monasteries, and the establishment of schools in Normandy and Northern France; and *Richard*, Abbot of Vannes, at Verdun, was equally successful in correcting the abuses which had crept into the monasteries of Belgium. The monks of Clugny kept the Rule of St. Benedict in all its primitive severity, observing *perpetual silence*, making public confession of their sins, working at manual labor, and leaving it only when called to perform some other duty, or to engage in prayer and the singing of the Psalter.[1]

For two centuries, the monks of the great abbey of Clugny, and those who went forth from it to labor in distant lands, sustained by their influence and example the spiritual life of Christendom, were the guardians and fosterers of science and learning, made a life of asceticism honorable, and, down to the days of St. Bernard, had a share in nearly every important affair of the Church.[2]

In Germany, the monastery of *Hirschau*, founded by Erlafried, Count of Calw, in the year 838, had, upon the death of Abbot Conrad (A. D. 1000), been deserted, and now stood greatly in need of repair. At the instance of Pope *Leo IX.*, it was restored by Adelbert II., also Count of Calw (since the year 1059), and put into the possession of a colony of monks from the monastery of *Our Lady of Hermits.* It rapidly rose in importance under *William*, formerly Prior of St. Emmeram, at Ratisbon, who became its abbot A. D. 1071, and reorganized it after the model of Clugny.[1] It soon acquired an extensive reputation, and from it went forth, during the abbacy of William, fresh colonies of monks to make new foundations, of which the best known are those of *Reichenbach*, in the valley of the Murg; *St. George*, at the sources of the Danube; *Weilheim*, under the Teck, which was some time later transferred to Brisgovia, under the name of *St. Peters;* besides many others. When the abbot William had completed these labors, besides others of a literary character, he died, full of years and honor, July 5, A. D. 1091.

---

[1] Antiqq. consuet., lib. II., c. 3: Silentium in ecclesia, dormitorio, refectorio et coquina—novitius opus habet, ut signa diligenter addiscat, quibus tacens quodammodo loquatur, c. 4. A description of the signa loquendi, in *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXXI., p. 386–431.

[2] **Kerker*, Blessed William, Abbot of Hirschau, etc., the restorer of South German Monasticism in the age of Gregory VII., Vol. I.

During the terrible conflict of parties which raged in *Italy*, the monks of the Benedictine convent of *Monte Cassino* were the only religious of that country who carried out in practice the holy traditions of their order; and though their influence was not sufficiently powerful to effect the reformation of other monasteries into which the spirit of worldliness had entered,[2] it was nevertheless sufficiently attractive to draw out of the very hurry and bustle of life a number of generous souls, who had grown weary of the world and its sinfulness, and yearned for a retreat where they might find quiet and peace of soul.

Such was *Romuald*, a member of the ducal family of Ravenna. When in the thirty-second year of his age, he was present at a duel, in which his father was one of the parties engaged, and seeing the latter plunge a knife into his adversary, he was so shocked at the deed, that he at once withdrew to the monastery of Monte Cassino, and gave himself up to a life of penance and prayer. After having passed many years among the mountains and in the depths of the forests, he made his appearance in Upper Italy, and began to preach penance to immoral and simoniacal priests; and so irresistible was his speech, and so subduing his glance,[1] that the most abandoned and obstinate of them, when appealed to by him, at once entered upon a change of life, and the most tepid grew active and energetic.

---

[1] *Greeven*, Activity of the Monks of Clugny during the eleventh century, in Church and State, Wesel, 1870. *Gfrörer*, Pope Gregory VII., Vol. I.

[2] *Tosti*, Storia della Badia di Montecassino, Napoli, 1842 sq. *Freiburg*, Eccl Cyclopaedia, Vol. VII., p. 277 sq.; French trans., Vol. 15, p. 279.

As his life drew near its close, he gathered about him a number of souls similar in tastes and dispositions to his own, and retiring to *Camaldoli*, a desert place among the Apennines, not far distant from Arezzo, in Tuscany, he laid the foundation of a new order (A. D. 1018), the members of which were clothed in a white habit,[2] and were known, from the place where they originated, as *Camaldolites*. They were composed partly of hermits and partly of cenobites; never spoke to each other, and abstained entirely from flesh-meat, and wine. The order was approved by Pope Alexander II., and it was not long until the Prior-General of Camaldoli had nine monasteries under his direction.

The order of *Vallombrosa*, in Tuscany, founded in the year 1038 by *St. John Gualbert*, a member of a noble Tuscan family, was, if anything, still more austere than that of the Camaldolites. John had had an experience somewhat similar to that passed through by Romuald. He was charged by his father to take a bloody vengeance upon the murderer of his brother Hugh, and, coming up with the object of his search on Good Friday, in a narrow defile, where escape was impossible, he made directly for him. The murderer threw himself upon his knees, and, arranging his arms in the form of a cross, besought his antagonist to show mercy out of love of Him who that day suffered for all. From respect for the symbol of salvation, and touched with the beauty of the appeal, John not only granted the prayer of the murderer, but took him to his bosom and adopted him in place of the brother he had lost. He then withdrew to pray in the neighboring monastery of San Miniate, and, while kneeling there before a crucifix, saw the figure of our Savior incline its head toward him. Accepting this as a token of Divine approval of what he had done, he at once entered upon an ascetical life, commenced the practice of great austerities, and ended by founding an order,[1] whose members were clothed in an *ash-colored* garment and observed the Rule of St. Benedict[2] in its more severe form. It was the original intention that the members of these two orders should lead an eremitical life, but this design was afterward given up, and they came together in monasteries, where each endeavored, by the holiness of his life, to contribute to the profit and edification of all the rest, and to their advancement in the spiritual perfection.

---

[1] His biographer, Peter Damian, relates that a certain great lord said of him that, "No look of an emperor, or of any other mortal, filled him with such terror, as the look of Romuald. He was at a loss what to say, or how to excuse himself." Life of Romuald, § 66. (Tr.)

[2] The rule of the order, in *Holstenii* Cod. regul. Monast., T. II., p. 194 sq.

So great and beneficial was the influence exercised by monastic houses during the eighth and ninth centuries, that kings and bishops willingly accorded them the right of freely electing their abbots and administering their temporal affairs. Freedom from restraint in the election of abbots was claimed as an ordinary and natural right by the Rule of St. Benedict, and was recognized by civil and ecclesiastical law. The monks were confirmed in their natural rights by popes, and sometimes protected against the arbitrary measures of bishops. The popes also exercised a direct jurisdiction over some monasteries, without, however, coming into conflict with the ordinary jurisdiction of bishops. But, as time went on, matters changed. In the eleventh century, the preponderance of papal power, and the ambition, avarice, and tyranny of the bishops,[3] both co-operated, each in its own way, to withdraw the monasteries, in a measure, from the jurisdiction of bishops, and to obtain for them extensive *privileges*. Thus, for example, some monasteries were exempted from episcopal visitation, and neither could a bishop depose their abbots. The only right left to the bishop was to bless the abbot, to ordain the monks, and to consecrate the churches and altars of the monastery. Clugny, which possessed more extensive privileges than any other abbey, had also the right of choosing the bishop to perform these functions. These grants, made by Alexander II. to Clugny, were confirmed by the Council of Châlon,[1] held A. D. 1063.

---

[1] We have preferred to follow the Roman Breviary. (Tr.)

[2] "Vallis Umbrosae Congregationis statuta adhuc nancisci nobis non contigit," is said in *Holstentus-Brockie*, T. II., p. 303.

[3] See ¿ 200, and also *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 196 sq. (Tr.)

§ 200. *Condition of the Church in the Leading Countries of Europe.*

Conf. *Döllinger*, Hist. of the Church, Eng. trans., Vol. III. (Period III., c. 5), p. 203–271.

The religious life of the bulk of the people, during the early half of the present epoch, was a faithful copy of that of the Roman pontiffs. The contrasts presented by different countries, in the course of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, are so marked that it is impossible to speak of them in general terms, or to bring them under one head. It is therefore necessary to take up the most important kingdoms of Europe in turn, and give a brief sketch of the condition of the Church in each.

The Frankish Empire.[2]—The unhappy dissensions and civil wars which broke out under Louis the Mild and his sons not only disturbed the peace of the great empire, but also seriously interfered with the development of the Church, retarded the growth of ecclesiastical discipline, and relaxed the bonds of Christian morality. The councils of Coulaines, Thionville, Loiré, Beauvais, and Meaux, held during the reign of Charles the Bald, could do but little to check the prevailing disorders. Their decrees were unheeded amid the ceaseless din of civil strife; and the constantly renewed invasions of the Normans, who plundered the monasteries and pulled down the churches, completed the wreck of civil order and ecclesiastical discipline. The great scholars who had given celebrity to the schools of Charlemagne had all passed away by the year 875, leaving none able to take their places.

---

[1] *Conc. Cabillonense*, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 1025 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1139 sq. *Mabillon*, Annal. Bened., lib. LXII., Num. 12. Conf. *Gfrörer*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 1487 sq.

[2] *Flodoardi* Historia Eccl. Remensis., see *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 135. *Glaber Radulphus*, Hist. Francor. (*Bouquet*, T. X.) *Le Cointe*, Annal. Ecclesiastici Francor., Par. 1668, f., T. IV.-VIII. *Longueval*, Histoire de l'église Gallicane, Par. 1732, T. IV.-VII., nouv. ed. par *Jaeger*.

So great was the ignorance of the clergy, that *Frotier*, Bishop of Poitiers, and *Fulrad*, Bishop of Paris, requested (A. D. 910) Abbo, a monk of the monastery of St. Germain, to compose a *Book of Homilies* (Homiliarium), from which priests might gain sufficient knowledge of the Christian religion to enable them to instruct the people in fundamental truths; and the fathers of the Council of Trosly (A. D. 909), speaking on the same subject, complained that many Christians had grown old without having learned the Our Father or the Creed. It was not long before the Carlovingian dynasty, weakened by the incessant encroachment of the powerful vassals of the empire, tottered to its ruin, and with it disappeared the respect and reverence that the people had hitherto manifested toward the Church. During the continuance of this political chaos it was impossible for the bishops of the Church to assemble in council and provide measures against existing and coming evils; and so universal and threatening were the disorders, that both civil and ecclesiastical society seemed on the point of a general break-up. As an example, it will be sufficient to instance the conduct of the powerful Herbert, Count of Vermandois, who (c. A. D. 925) had his son Hugh, a child of five years of age, appointed Archbishop of Rheims. But he was probably not so culpable as Pope John X., who had the assurance[1] to confirm the appointment, and to intrust the spiritual administration of the archdiocese to Abbo, Bishop of Soissons.[1]

It was about this time that that band of devoted men, gathered together in the *monastery* of *Clugny*,[2] gave promise of better things, not only to the Frankish Empire, but to every other Christian country as well. This auspicious beginning was supplemented by the restoration of political affairs in the Frankish Empire, under the new dynasty, of which *Hugh Capet* was the first representative (A. D. 987). It was also at this time that the Church, strongly impressed with the conviction that royal power could not make head against the encroachments of ignorant, insolent, powerful vassals, resolved to do what she could for the maintenance of law and order, and accordingly introduced the *Truce of God* and punished all infractions of it with ecclesiastical censures. These constantly increased in severity, till, in the course of the tenth century, they included the *Interdict*, which was so much the more dreaded, in that it went beyond the person of the offender and affected his possessions also. At times, whole countries, which had passed under the sway of some unscrupulous and powerful tyrant, were laid under interdict; but when such an exceptional state of things existed, provision was always made to enable the innocent to avail themselves of the means of sanctification. Bishops believed themselves justified in inflicting these censures out of a regard for the public welfare and from an instinct of self-preservation. But a weapon so powerful in those times, and one which should have been appealed to only on extraordinary occasions and for exceptional purposes, and then only by men of the greatest prudence, could not fail, at times, to become an instrument of mischief and danger, when placed in the hands of unworthy and worldly minded bishops. We have an example in point, in Robert, Archbishop of Rouen, who, because he was engaged in a quarrel with Duke Robert, placed the whole province of Normany under interdict.

---

[1] *Flodoardi* Hist. Eccl. Rhem., lib. IV., c. 20.

The Church made many efforts at this time to restore ecclesiastical discipline and purity of life, but the clergy, who had gone on, from day to day, violating their vow of chastity and securing benefices by simoniacal means, refused to listen to her admonitions and give up their habits of sin.

There were eighty councils held in France during the eleventh century, and of these there was not a single one in which a protest of the fathers was not directed against the *lawlessness* and *brigandage* of the *laity* and the *unchastity* and *simony* of the *clergy*. But when these disorders were at their height; when bishops presumed to settle the estates of the Church as dowers upon their daughters; when dukes and counts put on public sale the bishoprics and abbacies lying within their respective territories; when the weak had no rights that the strong were bound to respect, a reaction set in, good sprang from excess of evil, and new life from a dissolution of the old. This reformation, destined to raise the clergy from the depths to which they had fallen to their former purity of life, honor, and prestige, commenced with the chair of St. Peter, in the person of *Gregory V.*, and notably *Leo IX.* The reformatory decrees of the Council of Rheims (A. D. 1049) are framed in language of unusual severity.

It is refreshing to call to mind that, in the midst of the disorders, lawlessness, and anarchy of this age, there existed flourishing cathedral-schools at *Rheims*, *Chartres*, and *Tours*, conducted respectively by the distinguished masters, Gerbert (c. A. D. 970), Fulbert († A. D. 1028),[1] and Berengarius († A. D. 1088); and cloister-schools, not less flourishing, in the abbey of *Marmoutiers* (Majus monasterium), near Tours, which had been reformed by St. Majolus of Clugny, and in that of St. Benignus, at *Dijon*. But these schools, though excellent of their kind, could not compare with those of *Normandy*, during the eleventh century, as prosperous seats of learning. Such were those of the abbey of *Fécamp* and the monastery of *Bec*, under the direction of *Lanfranc*, the great theologian of his day, and of his still more illustrious disciple, *Anselm*. Both of these became afterward Archbishops of Canterbury.

The German Empire.[2]—This empire, formed after the death of Charles the Fat (A. D. 888), embraced the five nations of the East Franks, the Suabians, the Bavarians, the Thuringians, and the Saxons, and, after the time of St. Boniface, recognized the metropolitan church of *Mentz* as its ecclesiastical center. The suffragan sees of Mentz were Strasburg, Worms, Spire, Constance, Chur, Augsburg, Eichstädt, and Würzburg. This number was afterward increased to twelve by the addition of the Saxon sees of Paderborn, Halberstadt, Hildesheim, and Verden. Prague was added in the year 973, and Olmütz[3] in 1063.

---

[1] Cf. on Fulbert of Chartres, *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXXIII., p. 492 sq.

[2] Cf. the Chronicles of *Regino*, *Ditmar* of Merseburg, *Adam* of Bremen, and *Lambert* of Hersfeld. *Wittichindi* monach. Corbej. Annales (to 957). *Adelboldi* Vita Henrici II. *Wipponis* Vita Conradi Salici.—— *Sigm. Calles, S.J.*, Annales Eccles. Germ., T. IV., c. 5.

[3] See *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cycl., art. Olmütz. (Tr.)

Cologne was next made a metropolitan see, having as its suffragans the sees of Liége (formerly that of Tongres, and, until the year 708, called Maestricht), Utrecht, Münster, Minden, and Osnabrück.

The metropolitan see of *Treves* was established at a very early date, and comprised the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun.

In the year 798, *Salzburg* became the metropolitan see of the Bavarian bishoprics of Säben (called Brixen since the tenth century), Freysing, Ratisbon, and Passau. The suffragan sees of the archiepiscopal see of *Magdeburg*, established A. D. 968, were Zeitz (called Naumburg since the year 1029), Merseburg, Meissen, Havelberg, and Brandenburg. The metropolitan see of *Bremen* and *Hamburg* had under it Oldenburg (since called Lubec), established in 952, and in 1052 divided into the two bishoprics of Mecklenburg (afterward called Schwerin), and Ratzeburg. When Burgundy passed by inheritance to the kingdom of Germany, so also did the metropolitan see of *Besançon*, with its two suffragan bishoprics of Basle and Lausanne, the former of which, however, had belonged to Germany since 888, and the archbishoprics of *Lyons* and *Arles*.[1]

In the first *German* council that can be properly so called, held in the year 894, during the reign of King Arnulph, at the royal villa of *Tribur*, decrees were passed, providing for the restoration of discipline and the strengthening of ecclesiastical authority. But scarcely had some degree of order been restored in the Church of Germany, when it was again destroyed by the *devastating incursions of the Hungarians*, which commenced during the minority of Louis, the son and successor of Arnulph. Otho I. (A. D. 936–973) engaged and totally defeated the Hungarians on the *plain of Lech*,[2] and thus put an end to their depredations, saved the Church of Germany from the fate which had come upon that of France, and raised it to such a state of prosperity that it was far in advance of every church of European Christendom at that time. It is indeed true that during his reign Otho usually appointed the bishops of his kingdom, but in this instance there was some compensation made to the Church for the loss of her prerogative. The Saxon king was zealous, conscientious, and prudent, and rarely ever appointed a man to the office of bishop who was not distinguished by piety and learning. Hence the large number of great names that make his reign illustrious; men who, whether considered in their character of temporal rulers or spiritual guides, were truly the protectors and fathers of the people. Such were *Ulrich*, Bishop of Augsburg; *Bruno*, Archbishop of Cologne, and brother of Otho I.; *Adalbert*, Archbishop of Magdeburg; and *Frederic*, Archbishop of Mentz, who, notwithstanding his doubtful course as a politician, is worthy of being ranked with the great prelates of this reign. Then among the monasteries which gained a high reputation were those of *Corvey*, where Wittekind, the historian, resided, and of *St. Gall*, where Notker and Ekkehard were abbots. *Giesebrecht*, writing of this age, lays aside, for a time, his habitual prejudice, and gives utterance to the following words:[1] "It is, indeed, very true that the opening of the tenth century, which has been called, without limitation, a century of barbarism, was distinguished by a decline from the perfection in the arts and sciences reached at the close of the Carlovingian era. But about the middle of the century a new impulse was given to civilization in *Germany*, and then, for the first time, were the more northern countries penetrated with its true spirit. . . . The Roman Church has enrolled many of the bishops of that age among her saints, and to these does our German Fatherland owe a deep debt of gratitude."

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. III., pp. 218, 219. (Tr.)

[2] *Brunner*, O.S.B., The Incursions of the Hungarians into Germany. Programme of St. Stephen, at Augsburg, 1854.

Piligrim, Bishop of Passau, who, on three occasions, made pilgrimages to the Holy Land, also exercised a most beneficial influence upon the church of Germany; but the assertion that he obtained from Pope Leo VII. the metropolitan dignity of Lorch, and maintained it despite the efforts of the Archbishop of Salzburg, rests on the authority of entirely fictitious documents.[1]

---

[1] *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Times of the German Emperors, 2d ed., Vol. I., pp. 329, 330. Also, *Scheffel*, in his novel, *Ekkehard*, Frankft. 1864, etc., based on profound historical studies, furnishes an interesting picture of those times.

Under the two succeeding Othos, the son and grandson of Otho the Great, to whose zeal and energy the Church is indebted for the choice of the two Roman pontiffs, Gregory V. and Sylvester II., the election of bishops was left comparatively free, and in consequence the bishoprics of Germany were filled by men worthy of their high office. Such was the powerful chancellor of the empire, *Willigis*, Archbishop of Mentz; *St. Wolfgang*, Bishop of Ratisbon; *St. Gerhard*, Bishop of Toul; *St. Conrad*, Bishop of Constance; *Piligrim*, Bishop of Passau; *Bernward*, Bishop of Hildesheim (A. D. 993–1022), the tutor of Otho III., a man whose learning, ability, and artistic tastes placed him in the very front rank of his age; and his successor, *Godehard* (A. D. 1022–1038), distinguished by his gift of prophecy and for the admirable discipline which he maintained in his cathedral church.[2] The bishopric of *Merseburg* was restored, and, with the approbation of Pope John XVIII., another see established at *Bamberg* in the reign of Henry II., and conferred upon Eberhard, the chancellor of the empire. The establishment of this see called forth all the solicitous zeal of this pious Emperor. He appeared at the Council of Frankfort (A. D. 1006), and, casting himself upon his knees, besought the Fathers to consent to its erection. In the following year he succeeded in putting an end to the controversy concerning the jurisdiction of the convent of nuns at Gandersheim, which had been carried on for some time, with considerable temper, by Archbishop *Willigis* and a large following of German bishops, on the one hand, and on the other by Bernward of Hildesheim and Pope Sylvester II.

---

[1] Cf. *Dümmler*, Piligrim of Passau and the Archbishopric of Lorch, Lps. 1834 and *Mittermüller*, Was Piligrim a Forger of Documents? in the Periodical, The Catholic, 1867, Vol. 47, p. 333 sq. *Wattenbach*, Hist. Sources of Germany, p. 39.

[2] The latest researches concerning this age have developed rich materials for monographies, among which are the following: Archbishop Bruno of Cologne, by *Pieler*, Arnsberg, 1851; by *Meyer*, Berl. 1867; by *Schulze*, Halle, 1867; St. Ulrich of Augsburg, by *Raffer*, Augsbg. 1866; St. Wolfgang, by *Sulzbeck*, Ratisb. 1844; St. Matilda, Queen of Henry I., by *Clarus*, Quedlinbg. 1867; St. Adelaide, Queen of Otho I., by *Hüffer*, Berl. 1856; SS. Bernward and Godehard, by *Kratz*, Hildeshm. 1840, being the 3d part of "*The Cathedral of Hildesheim*," with illustrations. *Sulzbeck*, *O.S.B.*, Life of St. Godehard, Bishop and Patron Saint of the Diocese of Hildesheim, Ratisb. 1867. *Gfrörer*, The Services rendered to the Empire by the German Clergy at the Beginning of the Tenth Century (*Freiburg Review*, Vol. XIX., n. 1).

Although Henry II., in appointing to bishoprics, frequently conducted himself as arbitrarily as ever Otho I. had done, still it is but simple justice to him to say that he never selected one for the episcopal office who was unworthy of the dignity. The great number of bishops equally eminent for virtue and zeal, who occupied the sees of Germany during his reign, afford proof of this statement. To instance a few out of many, there were *Meinwerk* of Paderborn, *St. Walbodo* of Liége, *Burkhard* of Worms, and *Ditmar* of Merseburg, who is superior to any of the German historians who lived before the days of Lambert of Hersfeld.

Among the schools of that age which acquired the greatest name and celebrity were the cathedral-school of Liege, founded by Bishop Notker († A. D. 1008), and those of Fulda, Hildesheim, and Paderborn, the last of which was founded by Bishop Meinwerk.

The royal house of Saxony became extinct on the death of Henry II., and it was only by the wisdom, energy, and unanimity of the bishops in choosing his successor, that civil war, with all its direful consequences, was averted. *Conrad*, Duke of Franconia, the Salic, was elected without opposition, and by the wisdom of his administration fully verified the foresight of those who had raised him to the head of the German Empire. His episcopal appointments were excellent, as is proven by the fact, that, during his reign, flourished such men as *Poppo* of Strasburg, *Reginald* of Spire, the great biblical scholar *Bruno* of Würzburg, and *St. Bardo*, Archbishop of Mentz, who, as Abbot of Hersfeld, gained such consideration for his convent that the monastery of Fulda relinquished for a time in its favor the ancient right of appointing every alternate archbishop of Mentz. In the reign of Conrad II. are also to be found the names of *Altman* of Passau (A. D. 1065–1090) and *Unwan* of Bremen, well known as the zealous apostle of Northern Scandinavia, whose prudence won for him the friendship of Northern kings and Slavic princes.

Henry III.—who, in wisdom, purity of purpose, and singleness of mind, was not inferior to Charlemagne—deserves well of the Church for the share he had in raising to the Chair of St. Peter the Popes Clement II., Damasus II., Leo IX., and Victor II. He regarded clerical incontinency and simony as the most dangerous evils that could come upon the Church, and exerted himself to correct the one and suppress the other. St. Peter Damian, who will not be suspected of any undue partiality, in speaking of Henry in connection with the vice of simony, says that, after God, he was the means of destroying the hydra-headed monster. The Emperor's efforts were ably seconded by *Luitpold*, the excellent Archbishop of Mentz.

If the Pope was at this time in a position *to exercise a legitimate influence on the Church of Germany*, it was entirely due to the policy of Henry, by whose exertions the Holy See regained its ancient authority and consideration. And that the Holy See did, in matter of fact, wield such influence, is shown from the words of *Wazon*, Bishop of Liége, to the Emperor: "As," says he, "we owe obedience to the Pope, so do we owe fidelity to you."

But unfortunately, during the minority of his son, Henry IV., a greater part of which was spent under the evil influence of Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, simony, the prolific source of nearly all the evils that then afflicted the Church, again revived, and became more menacing than ever before. To it may be traced the origin of that fierce and pernicious controversy between the Papacy and the Empire, which was not brought to a close until after it had lasted through two centuries, and entailed the most disastrous results.

Italy.[1]—This country suffered perhaps more than any other from the migrations of the barbarians. Besides the general collapse of the established order of things, the inhabitants, being orthodox Christians, were treated with great violence by these fierce defenders of Arianism. But the Church did not lose heart. Chastened and strengthened by the trials through which she passed, she went forth with the vigor of new life, and the energy that comes of conflict, to the work of subduing these savage hordes, and bringing them within the bosom of the Church. And her efforts were not in vain. Arianism was vanquished, and, from the moment of its disappearance, a deep and earnest religious feeling pervaded the whole nation. Churches and cloisters arose in great numbers, and were amply endowed by munificent kings.

---

[1] See the writings of *Atto*, Bishop of Vercelli, *Ratherius* of Verona, *Luitprand* of Cremona, and those of *Peter Damian*, further down, Ch. V.

Anselm, Duke of Friuli, brother-in-law of the Lombard king Aistolphus, and founder and first abbot of the famous abbey of *Nonantula,* in the province of Modena, had, under his direction, scattered about in various convents, eleven hundred and forty-four monks. But as the Lombard power approached its decline, so also did this flourishing church cease to be what it once had been. *Paul Warnefried,* the national historian, complains that in his time the once honored church of St. John, at Monza, had come into the possession of *incontinent* and *simoniacal priests.*

Matters were somewhat improved during the domination of the Franks, and might have gone on well enough, had not the archbishops of Ravenna, and particularly Archbishop John (A. D. 850–878), persisted in asserting their independence, and refusing to obey the Holy See. The influence of the German emperors was too frequently interrupted to produce any permanent result. The Council of *Pavia* (A. D. 1022), presided over by Pope Benedict VIII., passed a number of decrees against the unchastity of ecclesiastics, but to little purpose. The clergy felt reassured by the evil example of *Guido,* Archbishop of *Milan,* and refused to leave off the practices of simony and their incontinent habits. The inhabitants of Milan were divided into two opposing parties—the one composed of worldly ecclesiastics and vicious seculars, representing the aristocracy, and powerful by reason of rank, wealth, and a community of interests; and the other of those who represented the bulk of the people, and were under the leadership of the two priests *Ariald* and *Landulf,* who, prompted by zeal for holy purity, and strengthened by the buoyant enthusiasm which the consciousness of laboring in a good cause always inspires, assaulted the defenders of simony and concubinage with uncommon vigor and determination. Those composing the popular party were at first treated with ridicule and contempt by their supercilious and aristocratic opponents, and were opprobriously called *Patarini*,[1] or fools; but they accepted and appropriated the name, and, like the epithet *Gueux*[2] of a later age, from having been a term of reproach and insult, became a title of distinction and honor. By the year 1057 they had so increased in numbers and influence that they compelled the body of the clergy to subscribe a document requiring the universal enforcement of the rule of celibacy. They also prevailed upon the people not to receive the sacraments at the hands of the married clergy. The party of the Patarini continued to be augmented by fresh recruits in harmony with its principles, and, extending its ramifications over the whole of Lombardy, assumed the character and proportions of a vast confederation, under the name of the *Pataria*, which, in the Milanese dialect, signifies a *popular faction*.

In the year 1061, Ariald, gathering about him a number of followers as generous, as zealous, and as enthusiastic as himself, introduced the canonical mode of community-life into the city of Milan, where it had never before been practiced. On the death of Landulf, his place was filled by his brother, *Herlembald*, a knight and a captain, who had just returned from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. He thought of withdrawing from the world and entering a monastery, but from this purpose he was dissuaded by Ariald, who besought him to defend the cause of God by arms, while he himself would do battle with spiritual weapons. Herlembald set out for

---

[1] Either from the city of Patara, in Lycia, or from the Pater Noster, their only prayer, or more probably from the Milanese word *pataria*. (Tr.)

[2] A name taken by the insurgents in the Netherlands, who, during the sixteenth century, rebelled against the Spanish government. When they had, on one occasion, forced themselves into the presence of the regent Margaret, she was seen to turn pale through fright; when the Count de Barlaimont whispered to her, in French, "Let not a troop of beggars (*Gueux*) alarm you." The words were heard by some of those present, and the title given to them by the count was afterward adopted by the rebels in one of their drinking parties. See *Schiller's* Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande. (Tr.)

Rome, to present himself to the Pope, before entering upon his task, and, while there, received the consecrated banner of St. Peter, which was to be unfurled, if necessary; was appointed standard-bearer of the Roman and Universal Church[1] (vexillifer Romanae et Universalis Ecclesiae), and, just before his return, in 1066, was handed a bull to take back with him, containing an excommunication of Guido, Archbishop of Milan. The promulgation of the sentence was the signal for the breaking out of a popular tumult among the fickle Milanese (A. D. 1067), in which *Ariald* fell a victim to his impetuous zeal. His body was not found till ten months later, but, even after that lapse of time, there were no indications of decay. Both people and clergy, recognizing in this circumstance an incontestable proof of his sanctity, now vied with each other in paying him the honors of a martyr. *Alexander II.*, coming to Milan shortly after, took his cause in hand, and, after the necessary preliminaries, placed him on the roll of the saints of the Church.

The origin of this popular movement, which was the occasion of so much good to the Church and of so complete a reformation of the clergy, may be directly traced to the silent cells of the *Camaldolites* and *Vallombrosians*.[2] The gravity of manner, moderation, and firmness of character displayed by the papal legate, *Peter Damian*, had no small share in bringing back the clergy to a better temper of mind, and in inspiring many of them with sentiments of sincere sorrow and repentance for their past lives.

---

[1] *Arnulphi* Mediolan. gesta Mediolanensium, in *Pertz*, T. VIII. *Landulfi* senioris Hist. Mediolan. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. IV.; *Pertz*, T. VIII.) *Bonizonis* Sutrien. Episc. lib. ad amicum (*Oefele*, Scriptt. rer. Boicar., T. II.) *B. Andreae* (disciple of Ariald) Vita St. Arialdi and *Landulfi* de St. Paulo (his contemporaries), Vita St. Arialdi (*Puricelli* de St. martyrib. Arialdo et Herlembaldo., Mediol. 1657; also in *Bolland.* Acta SS. ad d. 27. m. Junii). Andrew gives the following description of the Milanese clergy: "Alii cum canibus et accipitribus huc illucque pervagantes, alii vero tabernarii, alii usurarii existebant, cuncti fere cum publicis uxoribus sive scortis suam ignominiose ducebant vitam." Cf. also *Baron* ad a. 1061, n. 48. *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, Pt. VI., p. 335. *Acta Eccles Mediolan., a Carolo Cardinali S. Praxedis archiepiscopo condita, etc., ed. nova, Mediol. 1844, T. I. *The Pataria of Milan (*New* Sion, 1845, nros. 60–63, May). *Will*, The Beginnings of the Restoration, Pt. II., p. 100 sq. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., p. 749 sq.

[2] See the end of § 198.

Finally, the success of the test of *ordeal by fire*, which Peter, a Vallambrosian monk, called from this circumstance *Peter of the Fire* (Petrus Igneus), undertook for the purpose of proving the guilt of Guido, Archbishop of Milan, contributed much to raise the credit and strengthen the influence of the *Pataria*.

In recounting the causes which brought on the deplorable condition of the clergy during the tenth and eleventh centuries, it should be constantly borne in mind, that one of the most potent was the almost total neglect of theological studies. It is indeed true, that there were two schools of philosophy at Milan, and three training schools for ecclesiastics are mentioned as then existing at Parma, Bologna, and Faënza, but they were all of little importance, and it is not clear that the course of studies in any of them included more than the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium*.

The Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy.[1]—The institution of the parochial system by *Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury*, had early consolidated Christianity in England. A clergy distinguished for moral elevation of character and purity of life, trained in the numerous cloister-schools—all of which, but particularly that of Glastonbury, "the nursery of Saints," were then in a flourishing condition—hastened, by their example, their labors, and their single-minded earnestness, the work of spiritual regeneration. Here, as elsewhere, the important and disinterested labors rendered to society by these men, procured for Church property an exemption from all burdens and taxes, with the one exception of the "*trinoda necessitas*," or the levy for the maintenance of the army, and the repair of roads, bridges, and fortresses. The Church of England entertaining for Rome, whence came her first missionaries, the grateful affection of a daughter for a mother, always maintained the closest

---

[1] *Beda*, Chronicon Anglo-Saxonicum, ed. *Ingram.*, Lond. 1823, 4to. *Guilielmi Malmesburiensis* de gestis regum Anglor., libb. V. (to 1126); de gest. pontificum Anglor. (*Savile*, rer. Anglic. scriptt., Lond. 1596, f.) Ingulphi Abbatis Croylandensis descriptio compilata until 1066, in *Savile*. — — *Alfordi* Annal. Eccl. Brit., Leod. 1663, T. II. and III. *Lingard*, Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Newcastle, 1806, 2 vols.

---

union with the See of Peter. Eight of the Anglo-Saxon kings, inspired by the holiest motives, went on pilgrimages to the shrine of the apostles. It was also one of England's kings—probably either Ina of Wessex (A. D. 725), or Offa of Mercia (A. D. 790)—who first introduced the custom of paying *Peter's Pence* (Rome-Scot), with the design of creating a permanent fund to support English ecclesiastical schools at Rome. The head of every family, having a yearly income of thirty *solidi*, paid to the bishop of the diocese, in which he resided, one silver penny toward the fund.

There sprung up, around the great *metropolitan sees of Canterbury and York*, a number of suffragan bishoprics, which were soon in a flourishing condition.

At the Synod of Cloveshove (A. D. 803), twelve bishops recognized Ethelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury, as their metropolitan.

The Archbishop of York had three suffragans.[1]

If, on the one hand, the young Church of England possessed in the quality of her hierarchy a safe pledge of stability and vigorous life, she was, on the other, *equally sure that the close relations and frequent intercourse kept up between her clergy and the Church of Ireland would be a guaranty for their proficiency in scientific and theological knowledge.* It was thus that *Venerable Bede*,[2] of Northumbria, acquired in his own day the title of teacher of his people, and has been recognized as such by every succeeding age down to our own time. *Egbert*, his disciple, the son of a king, Archbishop of York, and, as an indefatigable student, the rival of his master, was the educator of the celebrated *Alcuin*, to whom the school of York owed its European reputation. But here, as on the continent, the progress of the Church was for a time interrupted by the invasions of the Barbarians. England was then blessed in possessing in *Alfred the Great*[1] a king equal to the emergency who, not content with having liberated his country from the yoke of the Danes (A. D. 880), forced these now vanquished conquerors to embrace the Christian faith. After having dispelled the danger with which the invaders threatened the nation, he set to work to prevent or correct an evil of a different nature, but not less formidable. Lawlessness had increased and ignorance become general, and, to provide a remedy for both, Alfred framed and published a new code of laws, gathered about him a number of scholars from France, either founded or restored the celebrated *School* of *Oxford*, translated into English the ecclesiastical histories of *Orosius* and Venerable Bede, the celebrated treatise of Boëthius "*On the Consolation of Philosophy*," the "*Pastoral Rule*" of St. Gregory, a portion of the Psalms, and extracts from the works of St. Augustine. In these undertakings he was aided by *Phlegmund*, Archbishop of Canterbury, and *Werfrith*, Bishop of Worcester. But even labors so extensive, entered upon from the highest motives, and prosecuted by Alfred at a cost of so much personal toil and painstaking, were found inadequate to remove the ignorance and correct the immorality which had followed upon the destruction of all educational establishments and monastic retreats by the Danes. Any one who presented himself for ordination was accepted without question, and the more unworthy he was, the more likely was he to prove a successful candidate.

---

[1] The suffragans of the Archbishop of Canterbury were: Rochester, in Kent; London, in Essex; Dunwich and Helmham (afterward Norwich), in East Anglia; Dorchester, Winchester, and Sherburne (afterward Salisbury), in Wessex; Selsey (afterward Chichester), in Sussex; Litchfield (afterward Coventry), Hereford, Worcester, and Lincoln, in Mercia. The suffragans of the Archbishop of York were: Sydnacester (formerly Lindisfarne, and afterward Durham), Hexham (which was destroyed in the devastations of the Danes), and Withern (Casa Candida), the bishopric founded by Ninian for the Southern Picts in Galloway. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 255. (TR.)

[2] See § 171.

In the year 860, the English clergy were openly reproached for keeping *concubines*, a charge which had never before been brought against them; and so general and notorious did the vice become among them, that the Council of London, held

---

[1] *Asserit* Menevensis Annales rer. gest. Alfredi, Oxon. 1722. *Stolberg*, The Life of Alfred the Great, King of England, Münster, 1815. *Weiss*, Hist. of Alfred the Great, Schaffhausen, 1852. *Malmesbury* relates: "Inter stridores lituorum, inter fremitus armorum leges tulit (Alfred rex), quibus sui et divino cultui et disciplinae militari assuescerent." On the *scientific* impulse imparted by Alfred, cf. *Stolberg*, l. l., p. 271–287. *Staudenmaier*, Scotus Erigena, Vol. I., p. 115 sq., 128 sq.

A. D. 944, during the reign of King Edmund, reminded them, in emphatic language, that they were obliged by their state of life to observe the rule of celibacy. The once flourishing and thronged monasteries of England were now deserted and going to ruin, and, in order to find persons to fill them, it was necessary to cross the channel and invite them from *France.* Among those who had been educated in that country and now passed over to England to restore ecclesiastical life, were *Dunstan*, *Oswald*, and others, besides many more in succeeding years. It would seem that France was now paying off a debt of gratitude which she owed to England for services of a similar kind, rendered in by-gone ages. But it was not from foreign lands that the chief aid came to England at this time. Of her own sons God graciously deigned to raise up instruments of his mercy. During the reign of King *Edred*, the third son of Edward and the successor to Alfred, *Turketul*, the chancellor of state, and *Dunstan*, who held the same office after him, embraced monastic life. The latter was shortly after elected abbot of the monastery of Glastonbury, and the former of that of Croyland, which, being badly out of repair, was restored by him. Dunstan was called from his monastery to be set over the see of Winchester, whence he was soon transferred to the archbishopric of Canterbury.[1] As he rose in dignity, his mind expanded, and he at once determined to undertake a thorough reformation of the corrupt and dissolute clergy.

The enterprise was taken up with enthusiasm by *Oswald*, Bishop of Worcester, and *Ethelwold*, Bishop of Winchester,[2] and powerfully seconded by King Edgar. "Consider," said this exemplary king at the Council of London (A. D. 969), to the venerable Dunstan, "that my father looks down upon you from high Heaven. Heed the words of grief in which he complains of the ruin of monasteries and churches which it gave him so much pleasure to build while on earth. Your warnings have been set at naught, and it now behooves you to have recourse to more severe measures for the chastisement of offenders. Go forward with the work, and the royal authority will sustain your judgments and enforce your commands. Drive the unworthy from ecclesiastic offices, and fill their places with men of virtue and ability."

---

[1] The biographies of St. Dunstan, by *Britforth* and *Osborn* (*Bolland.* m. *Maji*, T. IV., p. 344); by *Osbert* (*Surius*, vitae SS., T. III., p. 309, and *Wharton*, Angl. sacra, T. II., p. 211–226, under the name of *Eadmer;* then follows scrutinium de corpore St. Dunstani, p. 227–233). See *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 675, leges ctr. clericos conjugatos. **Katerkamp*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 516–522.

[2] *Eadmeri* Vita St. Oswaldi (*Wharton*, T. II., p. 191–210). *Wolstani* Vita St. Ethelwoldi (*Mabillon*, Acta SS. ord. St. Ben. saec. V.) Cf. *Wilkins*, Concilia Magnae Britan. et Hibern., Lond. 1737, T. I. *Stolberg-Kerg*, Pt. XXXI., p. 367–386.

Finally, Pope John XIII. gave the sanction of his authority to the work of the servant of God, and now a determined and uncompromising war was carried on against the vices of a rebellious and corrupt clergy, on the one hand, while, on the other, the reformation of monasteries went on simultaneously, and thus were emissaries provided for training the rising generation of ecclesiastics. By a conciliar enactment, the clergy in major orders were obliged either to observe the rule of celibacy or surrender their benefices.

Bishop Oswald of Worcester, anxious to introduce a reformation in his diocese, but unable to displace the corrupt clergy who occupied the old cathedral church, built another at a short distance from it, which was served by the regular clergy, and where he himself said Mass. Many of the canons attached to the old cathedral, seeing themselves abandoned by the people, became monks, and after a time the church reverted to the bishop, who handed it over to the Benedictines.

While the example of Oswald was followed in many instances, Dunstan enforced in numerous synods the canonical rule of celibacy, and King Edgar saw to it that these synodal enactments were carried into effect.

With the death of Edgar and Dunstan (A. D. 988) ended the last period of glory of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Conflicts again broke out between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes, who had settled in the island since the reign of King Alfred, and culminated, on November 13, A. D. 1002, in the frightful massacre of such of the latter as had taken up their abode in Saxon provinces.

By the accession of *Edward* the *Confessor* (A. D. 1042–1066), the scepter was restored to the ancient royal house of Britain; the island again enjoyed an interval of peace, and the bonds uniting the Church of England to the Apostolic See of Rome were strengthened.

Ireland.—The *Irish Church*, founded and firmly established by the labors of *St. Patrick*, early reached a high degree of perfection and enjoyed a large measure of prosperity. There went forth annually from her cloister-schools numbers of learned and pious ecclesiastics, both native and foreign, the latter being chiefly Anglo-Saxons, who labored successfully, both in England and on the continent. But, after the year 795, Ireland shared the ravages which at that time were desolating England. Both Danes and Normans made descents upon the island, and, true to their barbarous instincts, carried desolation wherever they went—pulled down churches and destroyed many of the most flourishing seats of ecclesiastical learning. As a consequence, many Irish bishops, priests, and monks sought an asylum either in England or on the continent. A naturally restless disposition and an inclination to travel were thus quickened and sharpened by actual experience, and it was no unusual thing to see Irish priests quitting their own land and immigrating to foreign countries, by way of preference and from love of variety.

Fortunately, about the year 800, the Irish clergy were released from the duty of following their princes to the field of battle; but their old martial spirit again revived during the ceaseless conflicts which they were obliged to carry on against the Danes, and priests and abbots were to be seen in the thick of the fight.

At the opening of the ninth century, the jurisdiction, or "Law of St. Patrick," as it was called, of the metropolitan see of Armagh, was extended over the whole island. One of the most striking phenomena in the history of the Irish Church of these times, was the practice of uniting the episcopal and royal authority in one person, of which the case of *Olchobair Mac Kennedy*, who was both Bishop of Emly and King of Cashel (A. D. 846), was the first instance. The most famous of these royal bishops was the warlike *Cormac Mac Cullinan*, Bishop of Cashel and King of Munster, who was slain in battle in the year 908. He was as scholarly as warlike, and is the author of the famous book known as the *Psalter of Cashel.*

About the year 927, the metropolitan see of *Armagh* passed into the hands of a powerful family, by whom it was retained for two hundred years. The representatives of this family being temporal princes, were called the lords of Armagh, and succeeded each other on the archiepiscopal throne, thus uniting in their several persons the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Out of this abuse sprang another and far worse one. These men, though they were married, and had never taken orders, or received episcopal consecration, assumed the title, rights, and prerogatives attached to the office of an archbishop, in all things except purely spiritual functions, which they left to bishops to perform.

About the middle of the eleventh century, the bulk of the Danes, who had settled in Ireland, had been converted to Christianity, and in the year 1040, or thereabout, obtained a bishop for themselves, with his see at Dublin. The first to occupy this see was Donatus, and the next Patrick, who, though an Irishman, was consecrated (1074) in England by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom, as well as to his successors, he promised canonical obedience. It would appear from this that the see of Dublin was a suffragan of that of Canterbury, but as no other Irish church ever stood in the same relation to an English see, it is more than probable that the Danes of Dublin sought this alliance because of the ties of relationship and common descent subsisting between them and the Normans, who were then supreme in England.

Besides the great number of Irish monks who were scattered here and there in the various monasteries of the continent, there were others who possessed their own cloisters, and lived by themselves. These Irish cloisters were especially numerous in Germany, where they were erected by the people out of gratitude for the great part taken by Irish monks in the work of their conversion. They served as schools for the German youth, and as hospices for Irish pilgrims traveling to Rome. Charles the Bald, in a capitulary of 845, speaks of the Hospices (*Hospitia Scotorum*), which

Irishmen had founded in France for the convenience of their countrymen. Among the Irish monasteries in France were those of St. Symphorian at Metz, of St. Vannes at Verdun, and of St. Martin at Cologne. Both Greek and Irish monks dwelt in the same monastery in the diocese of Toul, and sang the divine office together in the Greek language. An Irish monastery was founded at Erfurt, in the year 1036, and about the same time quite a number of Irishmen entered the abbey of Fulda.[1]

The Scotch monastery at Ratisbon existed until very recently, and that of Vienna, founded in 1155, and chartered in 1158 by *Henry Jasomirgott*, first Duke of Austria, for the Scotch or Irish Benedictines, is still in a flourishing condition, but has now passed out of the hands of those for whom it was originally founded.[2]

By the word *Scoti*, which is used so frequently in the ecclesiastical history of Germany, Italy, and France during this period, we are to understand, *not* natives of Northern Britain or the present Scotland—a greater part of which at the time of which we are speaking belonged to the kingdom of Northumbria, and was consequently under the dominion of the Anglo-Saxons—but *Irish* monks, who were then universally known as Scoti. Those who were correctly called Scots, inhabited the country of Argyle and the adjoining territory, and were comparatively few in number. Neither had they schools of such a character as to be able to send out evangelizers and learned monks, capable of gaining eminent distinction in other lands.[3]

Many Irish scholars during this period rose to eminence, and became famous for works on theology and science. Among the best known of these is *Virgilius* (Feargil or Veregil), who became bishop of Salzburg in 756. Previously to this time, he had been engaged in controversy with St. Boniface, first regarding a formula of baptism, which ran, "*in*

---

[1] See *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Eng. trans., Vol. III., p. 265 sq., London, 1841. (Tr.)

[2] Geschichte der Stadt Wien, by *Fr. Tschischka*, Stuttgart, 1847, p. 65. (Tr.)

[3] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., l. c. (Tr.)

nomine Patria et Filia et Spiritua Sancta," and was used by some ignorant persons in conferring the Sacrament, which, Boniface asserted, was invalid, and Virgilius denied; and next regarding the existence of antipodes, which Virgilius affirmed and Boniface denied. Virgilius was right in both instances. The two questions were referred to Pope Zachary, who decided that the formula was valid, but denied the possibility of the existence of antipodes,[1] because, as he argued, the admission would imply the existence of another world, inhabited by a race of men entirely different in origin from ourselves. Another eminent Irish scholar of this period is *Sedulius* (Sheil), Abbot of Kildare, who is the author of a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew (entitled *Collectaneum in Matthaeum*), and probably of another on the Epistles of St. Paul, which now goes under his name.[2] *Dungal,* his contemporary, lectured at Pavia, and was the opponent of Claudius of Turin, in the controversy concerning the use of images. Some time later lived *John Scotus Erigena,*[3] *Marianus Scotus,* who, in the year 1056, quitted the cloister of Clonard, and took up his residence in the Irish monastery at Cologne, whence he went to Fulda, and was afterward ordained priest at Salzburg. In 1073 he founded the monastery of St. Peter, at Ratisbon. Among his writings is a *Chronicle,* containing much valuable information on the history of the Irish, and of their settlements on the continent.

Scotland.—The monastery founded by St. Columba on the island of Ily, contained nearly all Irish monks, and continued for a long time to be the nursery of those missionaries who preached the Gospel in North Britain. Previously to the year 843, when the Picts and Scots united and became one nation, there was no established bishopric in Caledonia. In the year 849, King Kenneth, the conqueror of the Picts, built an episcopal church at Dunkeld, dedicated to St. Columba, and a house for ecclesiastics, where the bishop resided. It would appear that the Bishop of Dunkeld enjoyed a primacy over the whole Scottish Church until the close of the ninth century, when the metropolitan see was transferred to St. Andrew's.[1] The clergy were chiefly monks and Culdees, so called from *Keledei* (in Celtic, *Ceile De*), signifying, according to one interpretation, "servants of God," and according to another, those living in a community, but who were evidently only canons, who had adopted the rule of life given by Chrodegang of Metz. They are first mentioned in the history of Scotland, in the latter half of the ninth century.[2]

---

[1] *Kraus,* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 228. (Tr.)

[2] *Dixon,* Introd. to the S. Script., Vol. II., p. 216. (Tr.)

[3] He styled himself *Jerugena,* i. e. *ἱερούγενα*—a native of the *ἱερὸς νῆσος*—Insula Sanctorum; but it is also probable that the word Jerugena may be derived from *Erin* (The Green, i. e. Island), the Celtic name for Ireland.

In every diocese where there existed a community of Culdees, they always claimed the right of choosing one of their own number to fill the episcopal see when a vacancy occurred; and those of the metropolitan see of St. Andrew, besides claiming a precedence before every other Scottish religious community, also maintained that their consent was necessary to the appointment of a bishop to any see in the country. About the close of this epoch, there were altogether thirteen communities of them in Scotland. But their number, after this time, sensibly decreased—some withdrawing from community life to live in separate dwellings, and others to marry. Efforts were made by the bishops to reform them, but to little purpose, and their houses and churches were in consequence put in possession of regular canons, the greater part of whom came from England. King David I. gave the Kuldee cloister of Dunfermline to a colony of thirteen canons from Canterbury.

In the metropolitan see of St. Andrew's there existed, in the thirteenth century, a community of Culdees, who held places by inheritance from their relatives, side by side with a community of regular canons. The former disputed the right of the latter to elect the archbishop, and the case having been sent to Rome for settlement, was decided by Pope Boniface VIII. (A. D. 1297) in favor of the regular canons.

---

[1] Cf. the small Chronicles, in *Innes*, Critical Essay, London, 1729, 4to, 2 vols., and in *Pinkerton*, Inquiry into the Ancient History of Scotland, London, 1789, 2 vols.

[2] *Braun*, de Culdeis commentatio historico-eccles., Bonnae, 1840, 4to.

The Culdees are first mentioned as existing in Ireland, at Armagh, in the year 921, and, though not numerous, always lived according to the ancient practice followed by the priests who served the cathedral, in community life, after the manner of monks. Besides this community, there were seven others scattered through Ireland, viz., those of Clonmacnois, Clondalkin, Devenish, Clones, Popull, Monanincha, and Sligo.

About the year 936, and for some time after, there was a community of Culdees at the Cathedral of York, in England.[1]

Spain.—The Spanish Church, which had been placed upon a permanent footing during the reign of the Visigoth king Reccared, derived very great advantage from the wise ordinances of the *plenary councils of Toledo, which*, in the latter half of the present epoch, *were quite numerous, and held within short intervals of each other.*[2] Another beneficial effect of these measures was to put an end to secular interference in spiritual matters, and to secure to the Church—but for the good and in the interest of the State—a share in the administration of civil affairs.[3] The seventeenth Council of Toledo (A. D. 694) directed that civil affairs should not be taken up for discussion until after the close of the first three days during which ecclesiastical questions were determined, and none but clerics were admitted. The kings of Spain being at this time elective, the bishops, by the superior number of suffrages within their control, exercised a preponderating influence in choosing them; and as they had the power of placing the king on the throne, so were they his firmest support after he had reached it.

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Engl. trans., Vol. III., p. 267 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Eulogii* Cordubens. memoriale sanctor.; apologeticus pro martyr.; adhortatio ad martyr., and epp. (max. bibl., T. XV., and *Schotti* Hispania illustrata, T. IV.) *Pauli Alvari* indiculus luminosus, Samsonis Abbat. Cordub. apologeticus (España sagrada, ed. III., Matrit. 1792, T. XI.) Cf. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXVIII., p. 380–432.

[3] The numerous councils of Toledo: Toletanum IV. in the year 633; Tolet V. 636; Tolet. VI. 638; Tolet. VII. 646; Tolet. VIII. 653; Tolet. IX. 655; Tolet. X. 656; Conc. Emeritense, 666; Conc. Augustodun. 670; Tolet. XI. 673; Bracarense III. 675; Tolet. XII. 681; Tolet. XIII.-XVII. 683, 684, 688, 693, 694; Caesar-Augustan. III. 691.

Witiza (A. D. 701–710), one of these kings, by his disorderly and incontinent life, not only gave a most pernicious example to the clergy, who were still under the influence of the vices of the age, and more or less inclined to imitate the royal profligate, but also declared that the decretals of popes enjoining the rule of celibacy were not binding upon priests, and thereby broke off the harmonious relations which had heretofore existed between Spain and the Apostolic See, abruptly checked the prosperous course of the Spanish Church, and paved the way to its almost total destruction during the period of the *Saracen invasions* (A. D. 711 sq.) While the Mohammedans bore sway in Spain, the Church enjoyed at times a partial toleration, but, as a rule, was the victim of tyrannous oppression. The Goths, under their king, Pelagius, withdrew to the fastnesses of the mountains of Asturias, where they gallantly defended for some years their faith and the practice of its worship, till, encouraged by some successful encounters, they came forth from the mountain defiles, descended into the plains, and assaulted and captured the cities of Oviedo, Tuy, Leon, and Astorga (A. D. 795–842). Oviedo became an episcopal see, and Leon the residence of the Christian kings. About the middle of the ninth century, *Eneco Arista*, Count of Borgia, encouraged by these brilliant successes, laid the foundation of the kingdom of *Navarre*, and, two centuries later, the adjoining Christian kingdoms of *Aragon* and *Castile* came into existence. The Christians of Spain, who lived in the midst of Arabs and under Mohammedan rule, though enjoying only a precarious toleration of worship, retained, all through these years of trial and conflict, their ancient ecclesiastical organization, consisting of twenty-nine episcopal and three archiepiscopal sees; and, notwithstanding that they were compelled to pay a heavy monthly *capitation tax*, they not unfrequently filled important government offices. But, apart from all this, the fiery fanaticism of the Mohammedans, while constantly interfering with the toleration of Christian practices, frequently took a more offensive form and broke out into violent expressions of contempt for everything connected with the Catholic faith. The sign of the Cross was reviled and outraged, the ringing of bells ridiculed, and priests insulted. The Christians, irritated beyond human endurance, refused to submit to such indignities, and their protest was seized upon as a pretext for the terrible persecutions against them during the caliphate of *Abd-er-Rhaman II.*, *Mohammed I.*, and Abd-er-Rhaman III. (A. D. 850–960.) It will be remembered that, during the continuance of the persecutions by the Roman emperors, many Christians, either from a lack of moral courage or because they dreaded the terrible cruelties to which they would be subjected, lost heart and gave up their faith. The same thing took place in Spain under the Mohammedans; and, as if to leave no escape to the Christians, the very silence of such as were dragged before the tribunal was accepted by their judges as sufficient evidence of their guilt. But if there were some deplorable acts of apostasy, there were others of heroic courage. There was a long line of martyrs, who met death calmly indeed, but intrepidly, rather than deny their God. At their head was the Priest (*Perfectus*) of Cordova, then the seat of the caliphate; and, besides many other persons of rank and distinction, *Eulogius*, the Archbishop-elect of Toledo; *Aurelius*, who was quite young, and *Sabigotha*, his wife, who was still younger. The desire for martyrdom in time grew to be uselessly eager, and the *Council* of *Cordova* (A. D. 852) accordingly cautioned persons against unnecessarily putting themselves in the way of it. When the monk *John*, from the monastery of St. Gorze, near Metz, went to Spain on an embassy from Otho I., he had some intention of interfering in behalf of the Christians, but they besought him to take no such step, as its only effect would be to render their condition worse, and hints of similar import were addressed to him by the Saracens.[1] One of the bishops, speaking to him on the same subject, said: "We have passed under the dominion of a stranger because of our sins, and it is not lawful, as St. Paul says,[2] to resist those whom God has set over us; but in our trials the consolation of living according to the principles of our faith is still left us."

---

[1] Vita Abbatis Gorziensis (*Bollandus*, Acta SS. ad diem 27, mens. Febr., § 122. *Pertz*, T. VI., p. 372.

[2] Rom. xiii. 2.

This condition of affairs necessarily relaxed the bonds that united the Spanish Church to the Apostolic See; but more intimate relations were restored by Pope Leo IX., as we learn from the acts of the Council of *Tolosa*, held A. D. 1055, during the pontificate of Victor II. Not long after, the nine bishops of Aragon, assembled (A. D. 1060) at *Jacca*, in the province of Biscay, by a unanimous vote, resolved to give up the Gothic and adopt the Roman liturgy. Notwithstanding the action of these bishops, it was not until the pontificate of Gregory VII., and after many efforts had been made by Pope Alexander II., that the Mozarabic liturgy, which had been frequently defended by ordeals of fire and sword, was altogether given up (1080).

It will be seen, from the above statement of the condition of the Church in the various countries of Europe, that the religious life of the people depended, in a large measure, upon circumstances of time, place, and national characteristics, and that at the close of the ninth century and the opening of the tenth, the Church, notably in Italy and in some portions of the former Frankish Empire, had fallen from the high position to which she had been raised by Charlemagne to as low a depth as she could well reach, chiefly because the *authority of her Head*, the source of her life, strength, and energy, *was paralyzed in its action and influence upon the body ecclesiastic.*

In the midst of the turmoil and conflict of parties, it was but natural that the clergy should be distinguished by ignorance rather than learning; and, this being the case, it was equally natural that the bulk of the people should grow up without the necessary religious instruction and information. Such was, in matter of fact, the condition of things. People grew worldly and sensual; religion was, in many instances, little better than a gross and degrading superstition; the veneration paid to the saints was but a few removes from Paganism; the reverence given to images was excessively exaggerated; and so complete was the reliance placed upon the issue of every sort of *ordeals*[1] that the voice of bishops and the decrees of councils were powerless against them. The powerful nobles of the empire indulged in acts of reckless violence, and, there being no secular power capable of either restraining or suppressing them, there was an imperative call upon the Church to interpose her spiritual authority, if not in a domain, certainly in a manner unknown to her previous history. The belief, then prevalent throughout the whole West, that the year one thousand would bring with it the end of the world and the general judgment,[2] while it greatly increased the existing evils, was not without its beneficial results. Such as regarded the dreaded catastrophe from a religious point of view set about putting their consciences in order, and great numbers them went on pilgrimages to Rome and the Holy Land.[3]

Baronius, who in his "*Annals*" gives a somewhat exaggerated account of the rudeness and moral depravity of this "Age of Iron," is at some pains, before entering upon the history of the tenth century, to warn his readers in advance against taking scandal from what follows. "Let not the weak," he says, "be scandalized when they behold the abomination of desolation seated in the temple; but let them rather marvel and give thanks to God, who watches over the Church and and has her in His keeping, in that He did not visit upon her, in the midst of these abominations, the desolation that came upon the Temple of old." "And," he goes on to say, after a few sentences, "what was the cause of all these evils, whence so violent and destructive a storm?" "They are plainly," he answers, "from a cause such as no one could either suspect or believe, unless he should, so to speak, see it with his eyes and touch it with his hands, viz., the unspeakable indignities which were put upon the Apostolic See by princes calling themselves Christians, but, in this instance, certainly the most wicked of tyrants. When they took into their own hands the right of electing pontiffs to fill the Apostolic See, which even the angels of Heaven revere, such were the monsters whom they intruded into the chair of Peter that the very thought of them weighs the heart down with sadness."[1]

---

[1] See § 167 sub fin.

[2] Many documents of this epoch open thus: Appropinquante mundi termino; then also were made the greatest number of donations for the endowment of churches. *Glaber Radulph.*, lib. III., c. 4, relates: Infra millesimum tertio jam fere imminente anno contigit in universo paene terrarum orbe, praecipue tamen in Italia et in Galliis, innovari ecclesiarum basilicas, licet pleraeque decenter locatae minime indiguissent, etc.

[3] *Glaber Radulph.*, lib. IV., c. 6: Per idem tempus (about 1033) ex universo orbe tam innumerabilis multitudo coepit confluere ad sepulcrum Salvatoris Hierosolymis, quantam nullus hominum prius sperare poterat.

But, even in the midst of darkness so intense and of wickedness so astounding, the Holy Ghost was still at work in the Church and giving visible tokens of His presence in the holy lives and apostolic zeal of some fathers of the tenth century. Many of them, like Elias and John the Baptist of old, boldly and openly rebuked the vices of the world, while others cultivated virtue in silence and retirement, and advanced daily in well-doing and perfection.

The number of holy personages and flourishing institutions which there has been occasion to mention while setting forth the condition of the Church in the Frankish and German Empires, in Italy, the British Islands, and Spain,[2] will afford sufficient proof of the culture of the tenth century to prevent one from hastily concluding that it was wholly barbarous and immoral.

From the middle of the eleventh century, when the Holy See began gradually to regain its former dignity and authority, and to be filled with men whose virtues added a fresh luster to its ancient glory, a new life-stream broke forth from that fountain-head of the hierarchy, and infused fresh vigor into the entire body of the Church. The character of the times underwent a corresponding change; people grew more honorable, more pure, more earnest, and the improvement in public morals became still more marked and general after the introduction of the *Truce of God.*

---

[1] Cf. *Palma*, Prael. Hist. Eccl., Vol. II., p. 108 sq.; *Billuart*, Vol. IX., p. 287, and *Baronius*, Ann. Eccl., T. X., pp. 629, 630. (Tr.)

[2] *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXXI., p. 444–504; Pt. XXXII., p. 426 sq.; Pt. XXXIII., p. 439–525.

§ 201. *Religious Worship during This Epoch.*

Ordo Romanus de divin. officiis per totius anni circul. (eighth century.) *Amalarii*, Chorepisc. Metens., de divin. officiis, libb. IV., ad Ludov. imperat. (819–827.) *Rabani Mauri* de Clericor. Institutione et Ceremon. Eccl., libb. III. (819), and de Sacris Ordinib., Sacramentis Divin. et Vestimentis Sacerdot. *Walafried Strabo* († 849), de Exordiis et Increment. rer. Ecclesiastic., seu de Officiis Divinis. *Ivo* Carnoten. († 1115), de Ecclesiast. Sacramentis et offic. ac praecipuis per annum Festis Sermones (XXI.), collected in de Divin. Cath. Eccl. Officiis varii vett. Patrum ac Scriptt. libri., ed. *Hittorpius* (Col. 1568, Rom. 1591), Paris, 1624; on the Feasts: *Binterim*, Memorabilia, Vol. V., Pt. I., and especially the Acta Sanctorum, by *Bollandus*, on the respective feasts, where their origin and progress are carefully traced.

As the Germans are fond of noise and display, a public worship, to be acceptable to them, must be accompanied with a certain pomp and magnificence. This outward display had a higher office than the mere gratification of the senses. It spoke to an ignorant and sensuous people, in a language that was perfectly intelligible, of the great mysteries and the deep symbolism of the Christian religion. The cupolas and arches of the Romans were transferred to Germany, to be made subservient to the honor and glory of the God of Heaven and Earth; and the graceful columns, the rich ornamentation, and the crypts and raised choirs of the *Romanesque* style of architecture, found admirers and imitators among the inhabitants of these recently converted countries. *Bells*, which were now swung in bell-towers detached from the churches, or in steeples artistically finished, were consecrated, or, as it was generally called, baptized; and from this usage arose the custom of giving to each of them the name of some saint. Some of the churches were constructed of stone, but as a rule they were of wood; and, of those in France, one of the handsomest was the church of the abbey of St. George, at Rocheville; but even this was surpassed by the magnificent church of *Clugny*. In Germany, the most notable churches were those of St. Michael, at Hildesheim, built by Bishop Bernward; of Bamberg, built by Henry II.; and of Goslar, built by Henry III.

Architects, painters, and sculptors were as yet all ecclesiastics or lay-brothers belonging to the monasteries.[1]

New feasts were added, and pretty *generally* accepted,[2] to those which had been long observed in the Graeco-Roman Empire.[3] Such were the feasts of the *Annunciation* (March 25th), and of the *Purification* (February 2d), which in the Western Church took the place of the feast of the *Presentation of Christ in the Temple*, celebrated in the Eastern. To add still more to the honor of the Mother of Christ, two more feasts having special reference to her, and sanctioned by the tradition of the first three centuries, were introduced, viz., the *Assumption*[4] (Assumptio B. M. V., August 15th) and the *Nativity* (September 8th) of the Blessed Virgin. The origin and general adoption of the feast of *St. Michael* (dedicatio St. Michaelis, September 29th) were due to a celebrated apparition of the archangel in one of the churches of Rome.[5] It

---

[1] *Kreuser*, Christian Architecture, Vol. I., p. 265–328. *Laib* and *Schwarz*, Formalism of the Romanesque and Gothic Styles of Architecture, 2d ed., Stuttgart, 1858.

[2] The enumeration of the customary feasts, *Conc. Agathon.*, a. 506, can. 21 (*Harduin*, T. II., p. 1000); Capitular., lib. I., c. 158. *Conc. Mogunt.*, a. 813, can. 36: Festos dies in anno celebrare sancimus. Hoc est, *diem Dominicam Paschae* cum omni honore et sobrietate venerari, simili modo totam hebdomadem illam observari decrevimus. Diem *Ascensionis Domini* pleniter celebrare. Item *Pentecosten* similiter, ut in Pascha. In Natali Apostolorum *Petri* et *Pauli* diem unum. *Nativitatem S. Joannis Baptistae*, *Assumptionem S. Mariae*, Dedicationem *S. Michaëlis*, Natalem *S. Remigii*, *S. Martini*, *S. Andreae*. In *Natali Domini* dies quatuor, Octavas Domini, *Epiphaniam* Domini, *Purificationem S. Mariae*. Et illas *Festivitates Martyrum*, vel Confessorum observare decrevimus, quorum in unaquaque Parochia sancta corpora requiescunt. Similiter etiam *Dedicationem templi*.

[3] See Vol. I., §§ 93 and 134.

[4] The account given by *Epiphan.* haeres. 78, nr. 11; more positive, in *Gregor. Turon.* de glor. Mart., lib. I., c. 4; *Andreas Cretensis* (about 650), Homil. in dormitionem Mariae (*Galland.* bibl., T. XIII., p. 147); still more so in *Joan. Damascen. λόγοι γ′ εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν — θεοτόκου.* According to *Nicephor. Callisti* Hist. Eccl. II., 21 sq., XV. 14, and ibid. XVII. 28, Emperor Mauritius ordered the celebration of the *κοίμησις τῆς θεοτόκου* on the 15th of August. Cf. *Bolland.* Acta Sanctor. ad 15. Aug. If the tradition of the assumption of Mary into heaven be likewise found in apocryphal books, this is no proof that these are the only sources of our information, and that the respective liturgical prayers are derived therefrom. *Butler*, Lives of the Saints, Vol. VII. *Binterim*, Memor., Pt. V., p. 425–439. See Vol. I., p. 185.

[5] See Vol. I., p. 705.

Some moderns say, an angel (the archangel Michael, as Piazza has it,) was served to bring vividly before the mind of the people the existence of a world of spirits and to impress upon them the truth that a constant intercourse is kept up between the Church militant upon earth and the Church triumphant in Heaven. It was also in admirable accord with the warlike character and traditions of the Germans, who placed their arms and their fatherland under the protection of heavenly hosts.[1]

Special honor was paid in France to *St. Remigius* of Rheims and *St. Martin* of Tours. The writings of Denys the Areopagite, coming into the possession of Pepin, revived the memory of a Christian hero who had borne martyrdom for the faith in the Decian persecution; and as there had been a bishop of Paris, named Denys, who had also suffered martyrdom, people soon began to confound him with the contemporary of the apostles.

The memory of *St. James the Greater* was held in special honor in Spain, the scene of his apostolic labors, particularly after the supposed finding of his body at *Compostella* (A. D. 791–842). His reputed remains were highly venerated, and he himself chosen by the Spaniards as their patron in war. *St. Arnulph* was very much revered by the Germans, and the church dedicated to his honor at *Metz* gradually assumed the importance of a national shrine. But, lest the number of saints should become too numerous by the admission of such as did not deserve the title, the royal capitularies recommended great caution in the selection.[3] From the close of

---

seen sheathing his sword on the stately pile of Adrian's sepulcher on the cessation of the pestilence, shortly before Pope Gregory I.'s elevation. But no such circumstance is mentioned by St. Gregory of Tours, Bede, Paul, or John. *Butler's* Lives of the SS., 12th of March. (Tr.)

[1] *Haeberlin*, Selecta de Mich. Archangelo, Helmst. 1758, 4to. *Bolland.* ad 29. Sept.

[2] Acts xvii. 34.

[3] Capitul. a. 794, c. 40: Ut nulli novi Sancti colantur aut invocentur, ne memoriae eorum per vias erigantur; sed ii soli in ecclesia venerandi sint, qui ex auctoritate passionum aut vitae merito electi sint. (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 194.) Capit. a. 805, c. 17: De ecclesiis seu Sanctis noviter sine auctoritate inventis, nisi *Episcopo probante* minime venerentur. Salva etiam et de hoc et de omnibus ecclesiae *canonica auctoritate.* (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 299.)

the tenth century onward, the duty of watching over and regulating the veneration to be paid to the saints devolved entirely upon the Holy See, and *Pope Alexander III.* (A. D. 1170) formally reserved this right to the Roman pontiffs. The first instance of a process of "canonization" regularly instituted and decreed by the Pope was that of *St. Ulrich*, Bishop of Augsburg, who died A. D. 973, and was declared a saint, A. D. 993, by John XV.[1] The capitularies also enjoined the celebration of the feasts of the Church as a solemn duty, and ordered the closing of all courts of judicature upon such days.[2]

Finally, the feast of *All Saints*, instituted by Boniface IV. (November 1st), was very generally introduced among the Germans in the ninth century. There is a pious tradition, according to which *Odilo*, Abbot of *Clugny*, connected with this feast a *commemoration of the souls of the faithful departed*, and ordered it to be made in all the monasteries of his order (A. D. 998). This holy practice was soon taken up, and generally accepted as an expression of the Catholic belief in Purgatory, and of the close intercourse between the living and the dead; and eventually a special day (November 2d) was set apart for this devotion, and classed among the days of devotion of the Church.[3]

The feasts instituted in honor of the *Blessed Virgin Mary*, and the numerous and exquisite *hymns* composed in her praise, are so many tokens of the abundance of Christian love that went out to her, and an evidence that the veneration in which she was held by the Catholic Church grew in beauty and intensity as years went on.[1] The whole human family took up the words of the angelical salutation—"Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women"—and went on repeating them, with increasing warmth and devotion, till their very souls mounted up to the throne of the glorious Queen who reigns triumphantly in Heaven. The whole body of the faithful thus gave expression to their joy, their confidence, and their love in a prayer at once concise and full of meaning, comprehending, within the compass of a few words, stupendous mysteries of faith and the most important facts in the history of Redemption. Again putting together this prayer a certain number of times, and wreathing it into a *crown of living roses*, they presented the garland to the Mother of God as a token of their tender love and child-like confidence. It has been very erroneously asserted that this *mode* of prayer, called the *Rosary* (corona Mariana, rosarium, psalterium St. Virginis), was introduced, after the age of the Crusades, from the East, where it was in use among the Arabs; whereas the truth is, it had existed, though not in so elaborate a form, in the West, centuries before, and was probably first used in the fourth century by the monk *Macarius the Younger*, whose whole life was one continuous prayer.[2] It was his wont to say three hundred prayers daily, and, in order that he might know when he had got to the end of his task, he put three hundred pebbles into his lap before starting, and cast one of them away after reciting each prayer. Palladius states that the abbot *Paul*, of the desert of Fermé, had a similar custom. Even in the Penitentiary-books used in the West, twenty or thirty "Our Fathers" are frequently assigned as a penance.[1]

---

[1] *Concil. Roman.* a. 993, in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 169. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 727 (pro canonizatione St. Udalrici Augustani). Cf. *Mabill.* Praef. ad Acta SS. Ord. Ben. saec. V., num. 99 sq. *Benedictus XIV.*, de Beatificat. et Canoniz., lib. I., c. 7, 8. Cf. the art. *Canonization*, in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed.

[2] Capitulare III. a. 789, c. 18: Ut in dominicis diebus conventus et placita publica non faciant, nisi forte pro magna necessitate, aut hostilitate cogente, sed omnes ad Ecclesiam recurrant ad audiendum verbum Dei, et orationibus vel justis operibus vacent. Similiter et in festivitatibus praeclaris Deo et Ecclesiae conventui deserviant, et saecularia placita dimittant.

[3] *Mabill.* Acta SS. Ord. Ben. saec. VI., Pt. I., p. 584. *Petr. Damiani*, Vita Odilon, c. 10. (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. Jan., T. I., p. 74 sq.); *Siegebert. Gemblac.*, ad a. 998.

---

[1] Those well-known hymns of the Church, "Salve regina," "Ave maris stella," "Alma redemptoris mater," (but not "Omni die dic Mariae,") etc., all owe their origin to this part of our epoch, included between the ninth to the eleventh century. Cf. †*Hergenroether*, The Veneration of Mary during the first ten centuries of the Church, Münster, 1870.

[2] This office was first composed of canticles, as may be seen in the chapter of St. Ulrich of Augsburg (924). Cf. *Mabillon*, Annal. Bened., lib. XLII., nro. 71; *Saturday* was consecrated to Mary, according to *St. Peter Damian*, Opusc. XXXIII., c. 3. Urban II. made this office obligatory on the clergy at the *Council of Clermont*, 1095. The addition of the Angelical salutation to the "Our Father" was made first in the English monasteries. Cf. *Mabillon*, l. c., lib. LVIII., nros. 69, 70, ad annum 1044. Concerning the Rosary, as developed in its present form by St. Dominic in the thirteenth century, cf. *Binterim*, Mem., T. VI., Pt. I., p. 89–136. The *Devotion of the Rosary*, a Religious Meditation, Tübg. 1842.

In England, the inventiveness of piety suggested the arrangement of a number of *Pater Nosters* into a sort of circle or belt (beltidum, cingulum, girdle), which, little by little, was transformed into a *Rosary* in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the absence of devotional works, this mode of prayer furnished the people an easy and efficacious means of edification, suited to their wants and within their capacity. The devotion to the Blessed Virgin became still more general after the opening of the eleventh century. *Saturday* was especially dedicated to her honor. *Peter Damian* composed a particular office (Officium Mariae), which he had introduced into many of the monasteries of Italy; and the "Angelical Salutation" was combined with the "Lord's Prayer," though the use of this form of prayer did not become general till later on.

The Germans received the Christian faith with reverence, and conscientiously preserved it in its integrity as it came to them from the Greeks and Romans. And if there was any portion of it which appealed to them with more force, and of which they were more sensitive than another, it was that which comprehended the *seven Sacraments* and their symbolism and ceremonies. *Amalarius* of Metz, whose name is given at the head of this paragraph, gave the people a course of instructions upon the meaning of ecclesiastical ceremonies and the Sacred Liturgy. With regard to the administration of the sacrament of baptism, the rule of the early ages of the Church was followed, and it was ordained that it should be conferred only on the great feasts of Easter and Pentecost, and that the primitive ceremonies should be observed.[2] It was unfortunately necessary to enact many decrees against such as put off the baptism of their children beyond a twelvemonth.[1] There were also many complaints against such as neglected to call in the priest at the approach of death and receive the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. *Jonas*, Bishop of Orleans, imposed upon all persons dangerously ill the duty of calling in the priest and receiving the Sacred Unction at his hands, as recommended by the words of the apostle; and the *Council of Pavia* (A. D. 850) is still more instant on this point. Such of the sick as were unworthy of receiving Holy Communion were to be deprived of Extreme Unction also.[2]

---

[1] *Du Fresne*, Glossarium med. and inf. Latinit. sub verb. *Capellina*, wants to find the origin of the Rosary in the penitential books.

[2] Capitulare an. 804, c. 10: Ut nullus baptizare praesumat nisi in Pascha et Pentecoste, excepto infirmo (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 294), and oftener.

In the matter of *marriages* between persons nearly related, the Church maintained a most determined attitude, refusing to those who contracted such marriages the *benediction of the priest*, and threatening the refractory with sentence of excommunication. The secular power co-operated with the Church in this affair, and prohibited all incestuous unions. Relationship within the *seventh degree*[3] was constituted an invalidating impediment of matrimony; but the Council of Lateran (A. D. 1215) cut off three degrees, thus restricting impediments within the *fourth.*

The *Holy Eucharist* has always been, from the earliest ages down to our own, as it were, the meridian sun of Christian worship—the beginning and end, the source and center of every religious aspiration, thought, word, and act.

---

[1] Capit. a. 789, c. XIX.: Similiter placuit his decretis inserere, quod omnes infantes infra annum baptizentur. Et hoc statuimus, ut si quis infantem intra circulum anni ad baptismum offere contempserit sine consilio vel licentia sacerdotis, si de nobili genere fuerit, centum viginti solidos fisco componat; si ingenuus, sexaginta; si libertus, triginta. (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 183.)

[2] Already, Boniface prescribed: Omnes presbyteri oleum infirmorum ab episcopo exspectent secumque habeant et admoneant fideles infirmos, illud exquirere, ut eodem oleo peruncti a presbyteris sanentur. (*Würdtwein*, epp. Bonif., p. 142.) *Jonas*, de Institutione Laicali, lib. III., c. 14. *Synodus regia Ticina*, a. 850, can. 8. (*Harduin*, T. V., p. 27. *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 932 sq.)

[3] Capitul., lib. VII., c. 432: Nullus fidelium usque adfinitatis lineam, id est, usque *in septimam progeniem* consanguineam suam ducat uxorem, vel eam quoquo modo incestûs macula polluat. Cf. lib. VII., c. 436; lib. VI., c. 130. *Petri Damiani* Tractatus de parentelae et cognationis gradibus. Cf. *von Moy*, The Marriage Code of the Christians in the churches of the East and West, Vol. I., p. 361. *Walter*, Canon Law, ¿ 304, 13th ed., p. 599 sq. *Zhismann*, The Marriage Code of the Eastern Church, Vienna, 1864.

Unleavened bread was generally used at the *altar;* the accompanying ceremonies increased in number, elaborateness, and significance, and were more worthy of giving expression to the stupendous mystery of which they are the form and symbols, and of bringing out into fuller relief the points of discussion on which *Paschasius Radbertus* and *Berengarius* were at issue.

A timid fear, lest some drops of the Sacred Blood might be spilt, led to the use of tubes in drinking the Species, and to the practice of steeping the Host in the chalice. The Council of *Clermont* (A. D. 1095) prescribed[1] that the Body and Blood of Christ should be taken separately, except in cases where necessity required that they should be taken together.

The national churches, in order to express their close union with the Mother Church of Rome, used the *Latin language* in the liturgy and all religious rites and ceremonies, with the one exception of the sermon. It was, however, found necessary to correct an impression then gaining ground, to the effect that prayer could be addressed to God in only three languages, by the direct and emphatic declaration that prayer addressed to him in the proper spirit, in any language whatever, would be heard and answered.[2]

Again, *private Masses* (missae privatae, or rather, solitariae) celebrated by the priest, without the presence and participation of the faithful, were frequently and severely censured. How, it was asked, could a priest *so celebrating* truthfully say:[3] *Sursum corda*, or *Dominus vobiscum?*

The religious instruction of the people was pressed upon the clergy[1] with great urgency by both bishops and councils, but the standard of education was so low among them that little, if anything, could be expected from them in this respect. To remedy this condition of things somewhat, the bishops, following the example of Charlemagne, commissioned *Abbo*, a monk of St. Germain, to compose a new *Book of Homilies* (Homilarium) of such a character as might answer the needs of the clergy and serve them in instructing the faithful. The Roman liturgy had now superseded every other, and was in general use in the churches of nearly every nation. In Spain alone the *Mozarabic* liturgy[2] was used by the Christians, subject to the dominion of the Arabs. Its chief peculiarities are the following: 1. Though written in Latin, its character is essentially Greek; 2. It never adopted either the Gregorian or Ambrosian chant, and in this respect differed from all ancient Gaulish liturgies; 3. It implied or presupposed daily frequentation of Holy Communion and distribution of the chalice by the deacon; 4. It prescribed that the Host shall be elevated in sight of the people, after which it was to be broken into nine pieces, symbolizing the *nine* mysteries of Christ, viz., the Incarnation, Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Glorification; 5. Instead of the "*Ite, missa est,*" at the end of the Mass, it prescribes the following: "Solemnia completa sunt in nomine Dom. nostri Jesu Christi," or some such brief form of words.

---

[1] *Conc. Claromont.*, a. 1095, can. 28: Ne aliquis communicet de altari, nisi corpus separatim, et sanguinem similiter, nisi per necessitatem et *cautelam.* (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II. 1719. *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 818.) According to *Mansi*, the canon was decreed ob recens damnatam haeresim Berengarianam (?). Cf. *J. Vogt*, Historia Fistulae Eucharisticae, Brem. 1772.

[2] See p. 241, n. 2.

[3] *Conc. Mogunt.*, a. 813, can. 43: Nullus presbyter, ut nobis videtur, *solus* missam cantare valet recte. Quomodo enim dicet: Dominus vobiscum vel sursum corda admonebit habere, et alia multa his similia, cum alius *nemo* cum eo sit? (*Harzheim*, T. I., p. 412.)

---

[1] Ibidem., can. 45: Symbolum, quod est signaculum fidei, et orationem Dominicam discere semper admoneant sacerdotes populum Christianum. Volumusque, ut disciplinam condignam habeant, qui haec discere negligunt, sive in jejunio sive in alia castigatione emendentur. Propterea dignum est, ut filios suos donent ad scholam, sive ad monasteria, sive foras presbyteris, ut fidem catholicam recte discant et orationem Dominicam, ut domi alios edocere valeant. Et qui aliter non potuerit, vel in sua lingua hoc discat.

[2] The denomination "*Mozarabic*" given to the liturgy, is derived from the *Mozarabs* themselves. *Roderic*, Archbishop of Toledo (†1245), derives this name, in his Hist. Hispan. III., c. 22, from Mixtiarabes, eo quod mixti Arabibus convivebant; but better from Arabi Mustaraba, i. e. insititii, or naturalized Arabians, in contradistinction to Arabi Araba, or native Arabians. Cf. *Ed. Pocockii*, Spec. hist. Arabum, Oxon. 1650, p. 39. It is wrong to attribute the Mozarabic liturgy to *St. Isidore*. Cardinal *Ximenes* founded at Toledo a chapel, in which the divine service was performed according to the Mozarabic rite, and had the Missal printed at Toledo, 1500—the Breviary, 1502. *Leslei* Missale mixtum dictum Mozarabes, Romae, 1755, 2 T. 4to, in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 85, 86. Cf. Praefationes, tractatus, etc., in the Bollandists, T. III., p. 465–538, and Acta SS. mens. Julii, T. VI. *Martène*, de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, lib. I., c. IV., art. XII. (T. I., p. 168–173.) *Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, p. 158 sq. (2d ed., p. 147 sq.) *Gams*, Ch. H. of Spain, Vol. I., p. 103–117.

In order to add to the impressiveness and grandeur of Divine worship, Charlemagne caused the Roman liturgy to be substituted for that of ancient Gaul, which was but poorly adapted to the splendid effects of Gregorian chant. That the success of this noble church-song might be put beyond all question, competent choristers were brought from Rome;[1] "for," as the deacon John says, "the coarse German was as yet too rude and barbarous to undertake to render those grand old Roman melodies." On the other hand, the Romans said that the singing of the Germans resembled the howling of wild beasts.

Singing-schools were established by Charlemagne at *Metz* and *Soissons*. The organ (*organum*) which the Greek Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, had given to Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, was used for sustaining the voices.

The *singing-schools* of *St. Gall*, and that conducted by *Guido* of *Arezzo* in the monastery of Pomposa, became specially famous, which, in the case of the latter, is to be chiefly ascribed to the invention of *musical notation* (after A. D. 1024) by its master, who thus became the second founder of ecclesiastical music, as Gregory the Great had been the first.[2]

---

[1] Monach. Engolism., additamentum ad An. Lauriss. a. 787: — Mox petit domnus rex Carolus ab Adriano papa cantores, qui Franciam corrigerent de cantu. (*Pertz*, T. I., p. 171.) Cf. *Varin*, des Altérations de la Liturgie Grégorienne en France avant le XIII. siècle, Paris, 1852.

[2] *Schubiger*, The Singing-school of St. Gall, Einsiedeln, 1858. *Guido* once, while chanting with the monastery choir a hymn in honor of St. John, was struck with the gradual and regularly ascending tones of the opening syllabic sounds of each hemistich, in the three first verses:

Ut queant laxis *re*-sonare fibris
Mi-ra gestorum *fa*-muli tuorum
Sol-ve polluti *la*-bii reatum, etc.

And with the intuitive foresight of genius, he instantly comprehended the fitness of these sounds to form a new and perfect system of solfeggio. *Chambers'* Cyclopaed. (Tr.) Guido explains his new theory most fully in his Micro-

Great reverence and religious feeling, both in public worship and private devotions, were shown to *relics* of Christ and of the apostles and famous saints. The public sentiment in their favor went on increasing till it became necessary to check it[1] and put the faithful on their guard against persons who now, as on a former occasion, carried on a traffic in false relics. Properly authenticated ones rose to an enormous price,[2] and were frequently purchased at great sacrifices. Thus, for example, *Henry I.*, by prayers, threats, and finally by the cession of a portion of Suabia, obtained from Rudolph of Burgundy a lance of exquisite workmanship, into which one of the nails of the Cross had been ingeniously wrought. Again, the merchants of Venice paid an exorbitant sum for the body of St. Mark (A. D. 327). These relics were placed under altars and in costly shrines, or preserved in elaborately and artistically wrought cases, called *Reliquiaries.* They were carried in public processions, exposed when devotions were held to obtain some blessing or avert some calamity, and used in the administration of oaths.

An analogous feeling in favor of *pilgrimages* was developed among all orders of society. Troops of pilgrims set out from every quarter for *Jerusalem* and *Rome*, for *Tours* in France, *Compostella* in Spain, and *St. Gall* in Switzerland, either to expiate past and grievous sins, to beg new and special graces of God, or to stir up their faith and set their devotion aglow.

---

logus de Disciplina Artis Musicae. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. IV., p. 817–819. French transl., Vol. 10., p. 193–195.

[1] At *Vendôme*, a holy tear of Christ was venerated. Cf. *Thiers*, Dissertation sur la sainte larme de Vendôme, Paris, 1699, 12mo. *Mabillon*, Oeuvres Posthumes, T. II., p. 361 sq.; at *Reichenau*, sanguis Christi (cf. *Herman. Contract.* ad an. 923. The account given in *Mone's* Collections of the sources of the history of the Grand Duchy of Baden, Vol. I., p. 67–77, is a faithful reprint, according to *Mabillon*, Annal. III. 699, and *Pertz*, T. VI., p. 146 sq.); the Sacred Blood is also preserved at *Brüges*, in West Flanders, and in the monastery of *Weingarten*, in Würtemberg. On the *trial of fire for the relics*, see *Mabillon*, de probatione reliquiarum per ignem, after his liber de cultu SS. ignotorum, and the Analect., ed. II., p. 568 sq.

[2] Cf. *Sigbert. Gemblac.* ad. an. 929.

§ 202. *Ecclesiastical Discipline.*

Regino Abbas. Prumien., de Disciplina Eccles. Veterum praesertim Germonor., libb. II., see above, § 139. *Libri Poenitentiales*, in *Muratori*, Antiq. Ital. Medii Aevi, T V., p. 719. Also partly in *Martène*, de Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus, lib. I., c. VI.: "De ritibus ad sacrament. poenit. spectantibus" (ed. *Bassani*, 1788, T. I., p. 259 sq.) *Wasserschleben*, Penitentiary Ordinances, etc., see above, p. 162.

During the three centuries whose history we are relating everything was upheaved and in confusion. There were but faint traces of science, religion, and morality; human works and institutions had gone to ruin; the Gospel and the Church were indeed still what they had always been, but they stood solitary amid the wreck of a former civilization, and, to again resume their sway over the minds of men and make good the claims of their authority upon the obedience of society, required a stern discipline and the application of potent and extraordinary remedies. The Church could not hold the same language in speaking to these rude, untutored, and stubborn barbarians that she had formerly addressed to the polished Greek and law-abiding Roman. But, in speaking of these times, care should be taken not to condemn in the same terms all ages and countries. The ninth century was unlike the tenth, and this, again, unlike the eleventh; and so with the different States of Europe. For example, during the reign of Louis the Mild,[1] the spiritual and temporal powers, though not identical, were in some instances in accord—the two mutually assisting and supporting each other.

Like his father, Charlemagne, Louis the Mild commanded counts to render assistance to bishops, and bishops to lend the weight of their authority to counts—the two orders, as the Emperor goes on to explain, being equally sharers in the governing office (ministerium) committed by Divine appointment to the kings of the earth.

---

[1] Capitulare, ann. 823, c. 6: Vobis vero comitibus dicimus vosque commonemus, quia ad vestrum ministerium maxime pertinet, ut reverentiam et honorem sanctae Dei Ecclesiae exhibeatis, et cum Episcopis vestris concorditer vivatis, et eis adjutorium ad suum ministerium peragendum praebeatis, et ut vos ipsi in ministeriis vestris pacem et justitiam faciatis, etc. C. 9: Episcopis iterum, abbatibus et vassis nostris et omnibus fidelibus laicis dicimus, ut comitibus ad justitias faciendas adjutores sitis. C. 10: Episcopi vero vel comites et ad invicem et cum caeteris fidelibus concorditer vivant et ad sua ministeria peragenda vicissim sibi adjutorium ferant.

The later Carlovingians made frequent attempts to carry out in practice the theory of the mutual interdependence of the two orders, but with indifferent success. Bishops could not now, as formerly, count upon the adoption of their enactments, and the kings of the countries embraced by the old Frankish Empire no longer possessed either consideration or authority. Hence, if the Church was not to allow the rich harvest now ready for the sickle to pass through her hands without housing it, there was need of quick and energetic work. In the presence of a dissolute clergy and a lawless laity, such as then stood ranged against her, there was a call upon her, if she would combat with any hope of success, for more serious earnestness and a more determined resolution than she had ever before displayed, and for such vigilant and comprehensive legislation as would map out and include within its range every important interest at stake.

Neither did the Church mistake the times nor misapprehend her mission. While popes at times carried themselves as dictators in their dealings with bishops and laymen, bishops, on the other hand, pursued and punished offenders and criminals beyond the reach of civil justice. What bishops did in the case of laymen of inferior degree, the Church did in regard of those who put in practice what is now called the "religion of force;" who asserted the *right of the stronger;* whom no secular power dared oppose, and who, if permitted to go on, would confuse all order and destroy all security.

The bishops of Southern France, seizing upon a most opportune moment (A. D. 1031), when the country, having passed through several years (A. D. 1029–1031) of famine, was in the enjoyment of a year of plenty, as extraordinary under the circumstances as it was unexpected, and when the people were in a frame of mind to make atonement for past sins, and return thanks for present blessings, made a successful effort to suppress the violent disorders which had now become universal. Many councils, held at this time, appealed to the people at large to observe the *peace.* The cry of "Peace! Peace!" was caught up and borne from mouth to mouth, till the whole nation rang with its echo; and such was the transport of the people, in this outburst of religious enthusiasm, that many entertained the hope that the age of war and violence was passing away, and that *peace would reign forever.* All arms were put aside, and enemies sought out each other to forgive and be forgiven. People laid upon themselves the obligation of fasting on Fridays and Saturdays, and promised under oath to be always faithful to this practice.

But such rigor, introduced so suddenly, was beyond the strength and far in advance of the intelligence of the age, and, consequently, the most that could be done under the circumstances was to insist on the observance of the *canonical Truce of God*, which extended from *Wednesday evening* of one week to *Monday morning* of the next.[1] On the intervening days, which were commemorative of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, all violence was prohibited, and the proceedings of the courts of judicature suspended. This was a great point gained, inasmuch as it prepared public opinion for the introduction (A. D. 1041) of the *Peace of God* (*treuga or trevia Dei*), which was in force in the interval of every week, between *Thursday* and *Sunday;* during *Advent* and Christmas-tide, until after the octave of the Epiphany; during *Lent* and the Easter-cycle, until after the octave of Pentecost, and on every fast-day throughout the year.[1] Whoever refused to submit to the restrictions of the *Peace*, incurred the ban of the Church. That a true Christian could have recourse to violence, or indulge in acts of vindictive enmity, on feast-days, or in holy seasons sacred to the memory of the Redemption, was regarded as something beyond the limits of possibility. But in order that the Peace of God might henceforth have the force of law, and be religiously observed, those who broke it, or became guilty of other grave crimes, were, besides incurring former *excommunications*, laid under *interdict*. This not only affected the individual person of the offender, but was frequently extended to particular districts and whole provinces. The first example we have of the declaration and *execution* of an interdict was in the case of the county of Limoges (A. D. 1031), where the knights refused to observe the restrictions of the Peace of God.[2]

---

[1] Several bishops made the first attempt to suppress private feuds, at the *Council* of *Limoges*, 994. (*Bouquet*, T. X., p. 147; cf. 172, 227, 379.) King Robert at the *Council* of *Arles* (1016), de pace componenda. (*Fulberti Carnot.* ep. 21 ad Robert. *Bouquet*, T. X., p. 454.) The bishops of Aquitaine, at the *second Council of Limoges*, in the year 1031. (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 530 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 853 sq.) While here were heard, but in general, the words "*peace, peace*," it was, according to *Glaber Radulph.*, lib. V., c. 1, only in 1041, that the *peace of God* was instituted. Anno 1041 contigit, inspirante divina gratia, primitus in partibus Aquitanicis, deinde paulatim per universum Galliarum territorium, firmari pactum propter timorem Dei pariter et amorem: taliter ut nemo mortalium a feriae quartae vespere usque ad secundam feriam incipiente luce, ausu temerario praesumeret quippiam alicui hominum per vim auferre, neque ultionis vindictam a quocunque inimico exigere, nec etiam a fidejussore vadimonium sumere: quod si ab aliquo contigisset contra hoc decretum publicum, aut de vita componeret, aut a Christianorum consortio expulsus patria pelleretur. Hoc insuper placuit universis, veluti vulgo dicitur, ut *Treuga Domini* vocaretur: quae videlicet non solum humanis fulta praesidiis, verum etiam multotiens divinis suffragata terroribus. Contigit enim, ut dum pene per totas Gallias hoc statutum firmiter custodiretur, Neustriae gens illud suscipere recusaret. — Deinde quoque occulto Dei judicio coepit desaevire in ipsorum plebibus divina ultio: consumsit enim mortifer ardor multos, etc. (*Bouquet*, T. X., p. 59.) *Kluckhohn*, Hist. of the Peace of God, Lps. 1857. *Semichon*, la Paix et la Trève de Dieu, Paris, 1857. †*Fehr*, The Peace of God and the Cath. Church in the M. A., Augsburg, 1861. *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Period of German Emperors, Vol. II., p. 305 sq. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., in several places. Cf. Register, sub verbo, Treuga Dei.

The condition of a country laid under interdict was most distressing. None but ecclesiastics, beggars, and children under the age of two years, were entitled to Christian burial; Holy Communion was permitted only to those in danger of death; the divine offices were performed with closed doors and on naked altars; marriages could not be blessed; the use of flesh meat was prohibited; both ecclesiastics and laics were forbidden to trim their hair; in a word, everything, down to the minutest articles of dress, betokened a season of *mourning* and *penance*.

---

[1] *Conc. Claromont.*, a. 1095, can. 14: Quod ab adventu Domini usque ad octavas Epiphaniae, et a septuagesima usque ad octavas Pentecostes, et a quarta feria occidente sole omni tempore usque ad secundam feriam oriente sole, trevia Dei custodiatur. (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 904. Cf. below can. 8–10, p. 913; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1737.)

[2] At the second Council of Limoges, in the year 1031. (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 541. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 884.) *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. IV., pp 662, 663; cf. p. 606.

As regards *penitential discipline*, in the strictest sense of the terms, public penance had long since[1] been discontinued, except in the case of public crimes.[2] The ancient penitential rules had ceased to be observed, except in such places as still retained the *synodal courts of judicature*, and even here they were so modified as to meet and provide for cases occurring under the changed circumstances of the age. *Eriarth*, a monk who had killed a priest, was condemned by the Pope to twelve years of penance; during the first three of which he was obliged to stand with the weepers at the door of the church; during the fifth and sixth, he was admitted among the hearers, but forbidden to receive Holy Communion; and during the remaining seven, he was allowed to approach the Holy Table, but denied the privilege of presenting an offering. The Eighth Ecumenical Council enacted that the adherents of Photius should undergo the following public penance: They were to spend two years outside the church-door, among the weepers; two years among the class of catechumens admitted as hearers; and through all these years they were not permitted the use of flesh-meat or wine, except on Christmas-day and Sundays. The three subsequent years, they were to spend among the standers (consistentes), fast three days in the week, and approach the Holy Table only on the feasts of our Savior.

Guido, Archbishop *of Milan*, was condemned by Peter Damian to a penance of one hundred years,[1] with the privilege, however, of commuting each year into a certain sum of money, to be spent for the benefit of either the Church or the poor.

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 729, and § 169.

[2] As to the necessity of a particular confession of sins, we but remind the reader of the *Conc. Cabillon.* II., can. 32: Quia constat hominem ex duabus esse substantiis, anima videlicet et corpore, — solerti indagatione debent inquiri ipsa peccata, ut ex utrisque plena sit confessio: sc. ut ea confiteantur, quae per corpus gesta sunt, et ea, quibus in sola cogitatione delinquitur. (*Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1037. *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 99.) Cf. can. 25 on public penance: Poenitentiam agere juxta antiquam canonum constitutionem in plerisque locis ab usu recessit: — ut a domino imperatore impetretur adjutorium, qualiter si quis publice peccat, publica mulctetur poenitentia et secundum ordinem canonum merito suo excommunicetur et reconcilietur. Of like import is *Conc. Mogunt.* a. 847, can. 31: Modus tempusque poenitentiae peccata sua confitentibus aut per antiquorum canonum institutionem, aut per sanctarum scripturarum auctoritatem, aut per ecclesiasticam consuetudinem imponi debet a sacerdotibus, etc.

But these severe penances gradually gave way to the use of *indulgences* and the doing of good works; and pilgrimages were, little by little, substituted instead of the harsh and protracted penitential exercises of earlier years.[2] While the penitential code was thus being relaxed, quite a contrary tendency, which often carried those under its influence beyond all reasonable severity, was setting in. A class of penitents, who kept up *long watches* and *flogged* themselves mercilessly, was under the lead of *Peter Damian* and his disciple *Dominic Loricatus* ("clad in a cuirass," † A. D. 1062), who inspired them with the desire of expiating the sins of the world.[3] Such of the Christians as were not inclined to the side of severity went to Rome to obtain from the Pope a release from the heavy penances laid upon them by their bishops. The bishops, on the other hand, and several councils,[4] protested against this practice, and insisted that penitents, before setting out upon a pilgrimage to Rome, should have performed the penances laid upon them by priests, and that, in any event, permission to go to Rome should be obtained from the bishop.

---

[1] *Petri Damian.* ep. ad Hildebr.: Centum itaque annorum sibi poenitentiam indidi redemptionemque ejus taxatam per unumquemque annum pecuniae quantitate praefixi. (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 893.)

[2] *Petri Damian.* ep. ad V. Episc., in *Baron.* ad a. 1055, nr. 6: Non ignoras, quia cum a poenitentibus terras, possessiones agrorum videlicet accipimus, juxta mensuram muneris eis de quantitate poenitentiae relaxamus, sicut scriptum est: "Divitiae hominis redemptio ejus;" and already in *Regino* de Disc. Eccl., lib. II., c. 438, it is said: *De redemptionis pretio:* Si quis forte non potuerit jejunare et habuerit, unde possit redimere; si dives fuerit, pro VII. hebdomadis det solidos XX., si non habuerit tantum, unde dare possit, det solidos X. Sed attendat unusquisque, cui dare debeat, sive pro redemptione captivorum, sive supra st. altare, sive Dei servis, seu pauperibus in eleemosyna.

[3] Already in *Regino*, l. c., lib. II., c. 443, it is said: Quidam dixerunt, triduanas agere in verberibus et vigiliis insistendo triduum; c. 45, pro uno die in autumno, hieme, vel verno C. percussiones vel psalmos L., in aestate psalterium vel percussiones. As a voluntary acceptance of such a penance, we read in *Petrus Damian.* ep. ad Blancam comitissam, concerning Dominic Loricatus: Hujus st. senis exemplo faciendae disciplinae mos in nostris partibus inolevit, ut non modo viri, sed et nobiles mulieres hoc purgatorii genus inhianter arriperent. *Petr. Damian.* de laudibus flagellorum. (Epp. T. III., lib. IV., ep. 21; lib. VI., ep. 33.) Cf. *Boileau*, Hist. flagellantium.

[4] *Ahito*, episc. Basil. in capitular. a. 820, c. 18: Et hoc omnibus fidelibus denuntiandum, ut qui causa orationis ad limina beatorum Apostolorum pergere

Owing to the fuller development of ecclesiastical discipline, the following censures and punishments had now passed into general use: 1. *Excommunication*, which might entail, according to circumstances, either partial or entire exclusion from ecclesiastical communion and civil society, and was hence divided into the *greater* and *lesser* (excommunicatio major et minor); 2. *Anathema*, which was specially directed against heretics formally declared to be such; and, 3. *Interdict*, which was either local or personal, general or particular.

The effect in that age of the greater excommunication may be seen from the instance of *King Robert*, who, after sentence had been passed upon him, was deserted by every one, with the exception of two servants. Like St. Paul,[1] the Church tempered severity with indulgence; and like him, too, she would "that the sinner should be delivered up to Satan, to mortify his flesh and to save his soul in the day of judgment," until he should be prepared to do penance and make satisfaction to the Church of God for having outraged her majesty.

---

cupiunt, domi confiteantur peccata sua et sic proficiscantur, qui a proprio episcopo aut sacerdote ligandi aut exsolvendi sunt, non ab extraneo. *Conc. Salistad.* a. 1022, c. 18. *Gerbert* wrote in the name of *Adalbero*, Archbishop of Rheims, to the noble Baldwin, who had been excommunicated for having abandoned his wife, and who therefore turned his steps toward Rome: Nihil tibi profuerit, Romam adiisse, Dominum papam mendaciis delusisse, cum Paulus dicat: Si quis vobis aliud evangelizaverit praeter id quod accepistis, anathema. Estote ergo vobiscum divinarum legum defensores.

[5] 1 Cor. v. 5.

CHAPTER V.

THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE AND HERESIES.

§ 203. *Theological Literature — Works and Their Authors.*

†*Launoji* de Scholis celebriorib. sub Carolo M. et post eundem Carol. per Occidentem instauratis liber., Par. 1672, with *Mabillonii* iter Germ. ed. *Fabricius*, Hamb. 1718. *Thomassini* Vet. et Nova Eccl. Disciplina, Pt. II., lib. I., c. 96–100. *Braun, O.S.B.*, de pristinis Benedictorum Scholis, Monach. 1845 (Programme). *Haase*, de Medii Aevi studiis philologicis, Vratisl. 1856 (Programme).

Hock, Gerbert or Sylvester II., p. 24–59. *Hefele*, Scientific state of Southwestern Germany and Northern Switzerland during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, Tübg. Quart., year 1838, nro. 2, with many additions in his Contrib. to Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 279–315. *Bähr*, Hist. of the Roman Liturgy in the Carlovingian age, Carlsruhe, 1840. The works of *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des auteurs ecclés. des IXème, Xème and XIème siècles. *Cave*, Hist. Script. Eccles. *Oudinus*, Commentar. de Script. Eccles., T. II.; Hist. litt. de la France, T. IV.–VI. Also, The works of *Busse* and *Ceillier*.

So complete and thorough had been the labors of Charlemagne for the advancement of science that, when he had passed away, they continued to bear abundant fruit, which neither the wars of his children and grandchildren, nor the still more disastrous dissensions of the succeeding generation, nor the incursions of Normans, Slaves, and Saracens, could wholly destroy. But, even after his death, efficient measures were adopted to insure the advancement and success of shools. Bishops were obliged by conciliar enactments to erect schools and give a statement of their quality and efficiency to their metropolitans in provincial synods.[1] The cause was ably supported by Pope *Leo IV.* in Central, and by *Lothaire*, in Frankish Italy. King *Alfred* of England (A. D. 871–901) sent to France (A. D. 883) to obtain scholars to aid him in his work of education. His country, which had formerly abounded in flourishing schools, had been laid waste by the ravages of the Danes, and he was now forced to look abroad for men possessing the requisite qualifications to undertake the work of teaching.

---

[1] Capitul. a. 823, c. 5: Scholae sane ad filios et ministros ecclesiae instruendos vel edocendos, sicut nobis praeterito tempore ad Attiniacum promisistis et vobis injunximus, in congruis locis, ubi necdum perfectum est, ad multorum utilitatem et profectum a vobis ordinari non negligantur. (*Baluz*, T. I., p. 430. *Conc. Paris. VI.* a. 829, lib. I., c. 30: Sed super hoc ejusdem principis (Ludovici) admonitione, immo jussione a nonnullis rectoribus tepide et desidiose hactenus actum est. Unde omnibus nobis visum est, ut abhinc postposita totius corporis negligentia, ab omnibus diligentior in educandis et erudiendis militibus Christi

John, the Old Saxon, came from the monastery of Corvey, and the provost *Grimbald* from Rheims. With their assistance, Alfred founded, or rather restored, the famous school of Oxford.

Favored by the interval of peace that followed the treaty of Verdun, and encouraged by the literary tastes of *Charles the Bald*, the sciences revived for a season[1] in France, and the schools mentioned in a preceding paragraph[2] again flourished. A great cluster of brilliant scholars threw a halo of glory about the Frankish Empire in the days of its decline.

Agobard, Archbishop of *Lyons* († A. D. 841), attacked every sort of superstition—sometimes, indeed, in unmeasured terms, but always with point and energy. He was remarkable for breadth of view, boldness in expressing and clearness in setting forth his views and opinions, and for the strength and vigor of his style. But he was withal a hard-headed man and a severe reasoner, impatient of whatever was simply ideal

---

et vigilantior adhibeatur diligentia; et quando ad provinciale Episcoporum concilium conventum fuerit, unusquisque rectorum, sicut jam in praecedentibus memoratum est, scholasticos suos eidem concilio adesse faciat, ut suum solers studium circa divinum cultum omnibus manifestum fiat. (*Harduin*, T. IV., p. 1316; *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 588 sq.). And lib. III., c. 12, it is said in the ep. ad Ludov. Imperat.: Similiter obnixe ac suppliciter vestrae celsitudini suggerimus, ut morem paternum sequentes, saltem in tribus congruentissimis imperii vestri locis scholae publicae (higher institutions of learning) et vestra auctoritate fiant: ut labor patris vestri et vester per incuriam, quod absit, labefactando non pereat, quoniam ex hoc facto et magna utilitas et honor st. Dei ecclesiae et vobis magnum mercedis emolumentum et memoria sempiterna accrescet. (*Harduin*, IV., p. 1356; *Mansi*, T. IV., p. 599.)

[1] *Staudenmaier*, Scot. Erigena, Vol. I., p. 151–159.

[2] See § 172, sub fine.

or a matter of feeling.[1] *Claudius* of *Turin* was of a character still more bold and aggressive.[2]

Rabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda, and, after the year 847, Archbishop of Mentz († February 4, A. D. 856), a man of universal information and as rigorous in pursuing scientific researches as he was severe in his moral conduct and mode of life, was the creator of the scholastic institutions of Germany.[3] Yet his purpose was not so much to give to the world the results of original investigation and research as to promote the cause of education and contribute to the diffusion of knowledge, by placing before his contemporaries whatever was of importance or interest in antiquity. An idea of the degree of scientific culture then existing among the clergy, and of their method of viewing and treating scientific subjects, may be had from his tripartite work entitled "*De Institutione Clericorum.*" The first two parts contain, in an abridged form, the liturgical, pastoral, biblical, literary, and artistic information requisite for a priest in the discharge of the offices of his ministry; while the third part treats the question of *clerical education at length*, explains the "*seven liberal arts*" in very nearly the same words used by *St. Augustine*, and concludes with some observations on the value of ancient philosophy. That this work, written by its author originally "for the instruction of his own scholars and their pupils," exercised a great and beneficial influence upon all the cloister-schools of the Frankish Empire, there can be no doubt. He also gave in his work, "*De Universo*," a sort of universal encyclopaedia of the knowledge of his age. He richly deserved the fine eulogium of *Trithemius*, who said "*that no German who went before Maurus could at all approach him in finished scholarship.*"

---

[1] *Agobardi* opuscula (*Galland.*, T. XIII., p. 405 sq.; max. bibl., T. IX., p. 234 sq.), ed. *Baluz.*, Par. 1666, 2 v. 8. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 104. Cf. *Hundeshagen*, de Agobardi vita et scriptis, Giss. 1832.

[2] *Claudii Taurin.* fragm.; complete commentar. in ep. St. Pauli ad Galatas (max. bibl., T. XIV., p. 139 sq. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 104. Cf. thereon the preceding observations, ibid., p. 134 sq. *Mabillon*, Vet. Analecta, p. 90.) *Rudelbach*, Claudii inedit. opp. specimina, Havn. 1824.

[3] *Rabani Mauri* opp. Commentaries on many parts of the Bible, homilies; de Clericor. institutione et ceremoniis eccl., libb. III.; de sacris ordinib.; de universo; de sacramentis divinis et vestimentis sacerdot.; de disciplina eccl., libb. III.), ed. *Colvenerius*, Colon. 1627, 6 T., f., with *Joh. Trithemii* vita Rabani; in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 107–112. Conf. *Kunstmann*, Rabanus Magnentius Maurus, Mentz, 1841. *Bach*, On Rabanus Maurus, Creator of the scholastic Institutions of Germany (Programme), Fulda, 1855. *Spengler*, The Life of St. Rhab. Maur. for his millenary jubilee, Ratisbon, 1856.

His disciple, *Walafried Strabo*, Abbot of Reichenau († A. D. 849), is the author of some good Latin poems, a work on liturgy, lives of some of the saints, written in a pleasing and graceful style, and numerous *exegetical* writings of much service to his own and succeeding generations.[1] *Haymo*, Bishop of Halberstadt († A. D. 853), well known as the author of a Church History, left also some works on exegetics characterized by considerable independence of thought.[2] *Druthmar*, "the Grammarian," a monk of the monastery of Corbie, who had gained some reputation as a Greek and Hebrew scholar (c. A. D. 850), and *Angelomus*, a Benedictine of Luxeuil, both wrote commentaries on the Scriptures, of considerable merit for that age.[3]

These exegetical studies, though pursued in the Latin language, were not without their influence upon German literature. Poetical works based upon the Scripture narrative, and drawing their inspiration from it, soon began to make their appearance. The first and most important of these is the Gospel epic entitled the "*Heliand*" (Heiland, or Savior), written in the reign of Louis the Mild. It is a life of Christ, based on the history of the four Gospels, and written in the elevated language of the epic so familiar to the Anglo-Saxons, and in the form of alliteration. Christ is represented as a great and powerful Prince, the King and Ruler of many peoples, to whom, as becomes his high estate, He graciously distributes the wealth and treasures of Heaven. This is the only truly Christian epic ever written, and is still without a rival in sublimity of conception and elevated religious sentiment. It is, as it were, the outcome and expression of "*Christianity transformed into the blood and life of the Germans.*"

---

[1] De exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticar. (*Hittorp.* scriptt. de divin. officiis); commentar. in Psalmos; glossa ordinaria interlinearis in biblia, vitae St. Galli, Othmari, et alior., in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 113–115. Cf. *König*, Walafried Strabo, see above, p. 104, n. 3. *Hefele*, l. c., p. 229–232.

[2] *Haymon.* opp., in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 116–118. Cf. *Derling*, de Haymone, Helmst. 1747, 4to; Hist. lit. de la France, T. V., p. 111–126; *Liverani*, Spicilegium Liberian., Florent. 1865, p. 207–534.

[3] *Druthmarii* expositio in Matthaeum, Lucam et Joannem. (Max. bibl., T. XV.; *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 106.) *Druthmar* says that he wrote this "Expositio" because St. Jerome had omitted to explain many terms, deeming them easy of comprehension, whereas, in matter of fact, they were not. The same writer gives the following explanation of his method of exegesis: Studui plus historicum sensum quam spiritualem, quia irrationabile mihi videtur spiritualem intelligentiam in libro aliquo quaerere et historicam penitus ignorare, cum historia fundamentum omnis intelligentiae sit, et ipsa primitus quaerenda et amplexânda et sine ipsa perfecte ad alia non possit transiri. *Angelomi* comment. in Genesin; enarrationes in IV. libros regum, in Cantica canticorum. (Max. bibl., T. XV.)

In *Upper Germany*, about thirty years later, *Otfried*, a monk of the monastery of Weissenburg in Alsace (A. D. 865), wrote a poetical paraphrase of the Gospels, which, while inferior in grandeur of conception to the Heliand, is in other respects very similar to its "thaz wir Kriste sungun in unsera Zungun."[1]

Hincmar,[2] Archbishop of Rheims (A. D. 882), who was an excellent canonist, has left many controversial writings and letters, chiefly local in character, and put forth as occasion required, but valuable as contributions to the history of his age.

Paschasius Radbertus († A. D. 865) wrote commentaries on various portions of the Holy Scriptures,[3] and is the author of an exposition of the *Blessed Eucharist*, in which he sets forth the *doctrine* of its connection with the Incarnation and its legitimate consequences with great accuracy and precision, but in terms unfamiliar to theologians. He was bitterly assailed by many of the disciples of Alcuin for this *departure* from accepted philological usage. *Anastasius* the *Librarian*, a Roman priest († A. D. 886), compiled the lives of a number of Popes, to which he added others of his own composition.[1] *Halitgar*,[2] Archbishop of Cambrai and Arras, had acquired a well-earned reputation, years before any of the writers whom we have thus far mentioned, by his admirable treatise on the administration of the Sacrament of Penance.

---

[1] *Heliand*, an ancient Saxon Harmony of the Gospels, edited by *Schmeller*, Munich, 1830; by *Köne*, in its original text, with translation, annotations, and index of words, Münster, 1855; transl. by *Simrock*, Elberfeld, 1856; by *M. Heyne*, Paderborn, 1866. Cf. *Vilmar*, Hist. of Germ. Nat. Lit., Vol. I., at the beginning.—*Otfried's* Christ, ed. by *Graff*, Königsberg, 1856; by *J. Kelle*, Ratisbon. 1856–1857, 2 vols. Cf. *Behringer*, Krist and Heliand, Berl. 1870.

[2] *Hincmari* liber de praedestinatione; de divortio Lotharii; de jure metropolitanorum; de presbyteris criminosis; opusculum ss. capitulorum adv. Hincmar. Laudun., etc., in opp. ed. *Sirmond.*, Par. 1645, 2 T., f. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 125, 126. Cf. *Flodoard.*, Hist. Rem., lib. III., c. 15–29, and Hist. littér. de la France, T. V., p. 455 sq.

[3] *Paschasii Radb.* Commentar. in evang. Matth., lib. XII. (Max. bibl., T. XIV.), expositio in Ps. 44. (Max. bibl., T. XIV.; *Migne's* Ser. Lat., T. 127–129.)

Passing by the numerous annalists and chroniclers, we shall mention only the celebrated historian *Theganus*, chorepiscopus of Hectus, Archbishop of Treves († A. D. 849), *Einhard* († after A. D. 848), *Rapert* of St. Gall († before A. D. 880), the author who goes under the name of Monachus Sangallensis (Notker?) (c. A. D. 884), and finally, one who excites a greater interest than most any other man of his age. We mean the illustrious and learned head of the Palatine School of Charles the Bald.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA.[3]

Little is known of the personal history of this man; neither the place of his birth (England, Ireland, or Scotland?), nor the master who trained him, nor the disciples formed by him, nor what manner of death brought his days to a close—whether murdered by a band of infuriated students at Oxford or Malmesbury (c. A. D. 883), or whether he came to his end in some less violent way—all is equally an enigma that has stimulated the curiosity and baffled the researches of scholars. He was the *first* man in the West, and the *only* one in any country for three centuries, who, traveling beyond the traditionary limits of logic and dialectics, built up a strictly coherent system of metaphysics. But he was also fortunately the only writer of those times who was so far carried away by the beauty and charm of ancient Pagan learning as to lose sight of the fundamental truths of Christianity. *The essential difference between Creator and creature, between mind and matter*, was to his intellect hazy and uncertain.

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 40, note 3.

[2] *Halitgarii* de vitiis et virtutib. et ordine Poenitentium, lib. V. (Max. bibl., T. XIV., p. 906 sq. *Canisii* Lectt. Antiq., T. II., Pt. II., p. 81 sq.)

[3] *Scoti Erigen.* lib. de divina praedestinatione ctr. Godeschalcum, ed. *Mauguin.*, Par. 1600, 4to. His principal work, De Divisione Naturae, ed. *Gale.*, Oxon. 1681, ed. *Schlüter*, Monast. 1838, was condemned by *Leo IX.* (1050) and *Honorius III.* (1225) as heretical. Honorius characterizes it as librum scatentem vermibus haereticae pravitatis); de Eucharistia is lost. *Translation* of the *Ethics* of *Aristotle* and of the writings of *Denys the Areopagite*, on the demand of Charles the Bald; Erigena's commentary on *Denys the Areopagite's Hierarchia Coelestis*, discovered by *Doctor Greith*, and published in *Joan. Scoti* Opera omnia, ed. *Floss*, in *Migne's* Ser. Lat., T. 122, Paris, 1853.—*Peder Hyort*, Johannes Scotus Erigena, Copenhagen, 1823. *Staudenmaier*, Joh. Scot. Erigena and the science of his time, but 1 vol., Frcft. 1834. *The same*, Philosophy of Christianity, T. I., p. 536–632. *Hock*, Joh. Scot. Erigena, Supplement to the Hist. of Christian Philosophy (*Bonn Review*, nro. 16, p. 33 sq.) *Taillandier*, Scote Erigène et la Philosophie Scholastique, Paris, 1843. †*Möller*, Joh. Scot. Erigena and his Errors, Mentz, 1844. De vita et praeceptis Joan. Scoti Erig., Bonnae, 1845, and in *Floss*, l. c. Exhaustive treatises by *Chriestlieb*, The Life and Doc-

Huber and *Stöckl*, after a careful analysis of his work, "*De Divisione Naturae*," have pronounced it to be little more than an exposition of the *idealistic Pantheism* of the Neo-Platonists, with consequences equally far-reaching and startling.[1] The process by which everything is created and exists is *emanation*. This principle runs through everything. It is the

---

trine of John Scot. Erig., Gotha, 1860. *Huber*, John Scot. Erig., Munich, 1861. *Stöckl*, Hist. of the Philos. of the Middle Ages, Mentz, 1864, Vol. I., p. 31–128.

[1] The titles of the four sections of the work, "*De Divisione Naturae*," are: "I. The substance that creates, and is not created; II. That which creates, and is created; III. That which is created, and creates not; IV. That which is neither created nor creates."

"He (Erigena) classifies all things as 'things that are' and 'things that are not,' the whole being included in the term nature. This nature is divided into four species, as: 1. The nature that creates, and is uncreate; 2. The nature that creates, and is create; 3. The nature that creates not, and is create; 4. The nature that creates not, and is uncreate. (1) is the Divine Being, whose relation to the universe is so described as to lead straight to Pantheism; (2) is the world of prototypal ideas, having its principle of unity in the Logos, agreeably to the systems of Plato, Philo, and the Pseudo-Dionysius; (3) is the world of sense and its concentration in man, from whence Realism was afterward developed; (4) return to God, by predestined decree, 'all things,' as proceeding forth from the Divine existence, and returning into it, may be termed uncreate, as subsisting in the Absolute. . . . The germs of nearly every school of modern philosophy are foreshadowed in the writings of Erigena." *Blunt*, Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol., art. Pantheism, and Sects and Heresies, art. Schoolmen. (Tr.)

basis of both cosmogony and theogony. "All is God and God is all." The universal principle of Divinity is compared to a mighty river, which, flowing from its source, quickens all things in its course, and is returned to the fountain-head by exhalation and condensation, to be again poured forth in fresh and life-giving streams. The diffusion of the quickening principle throughout all things is called *resolution.* The gathering up of these scattered vital forces and the returning of them to their source is called *deification.* Hence, if man has fallen from his primitive condition and strayed from God, it is but one phase of the universal economy of existences—one development of a transitionary state that will eventually terminate in his return to God; and this law, running through all things, gradually works out the perfection of the Divinity. The law thus exemplified in the *fall* of man is equally applicable to the theogonic process, as is shown in the work of *redemption.*

Erigena is at great pains to strengthen his theory by quotations from the writings of Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Denys the Areopagite, and Maximus among the Greeks, and from those of Ambrose and Augustine among the Latins. The words of these great authors are ingeniously worked up to suit his purpose and fit into his system. Erigena was the forerunner of the Pantheism of the Middle Ages, and of the heresy of Berengarius on the Eucharist; and his writings indirectly led the way to false theories on the relation of faith to science, on the nature of evil, and on predestination. From what has been said, it will scarcely be a matter of surprise that his works were in subsequent years frequently condemned.

But, in justice to Erigena, it must be said that his writings possess a certain elevation and grandeur, a freshness and originality, and a brilliancy that dazzle and please. He was an elegant Greek scholar; was perfectly familiar with the writings and systems of Greek philosophers, and with the works of the Fathers of the Church, both Greek and Latin; combined skill in method with a luminous exposition; and was frequently so full of his subject that he resorted to the form of soliloquy to give it adequate expression. He was also the forerunner of the mysticism of the Schoolmen, or the *union* of contemplative piety with scientific theology, and led off in the controversy on Universals. *Mannon*, the translator of Plato's Timaeus, was also engaged in furthering the work of Erigena. Many *Greeks* and *Englishmen*, driven from their country—the former by the persecutions of the Iconoclasts, and the latter by the devastating incursions of the Danes—gathered about these two learned and zealous scholars.

After the death of Charles the Bald (A. D. 876), the influence of Charlemagne was no longer felt; and, until the accession of Otho I., Germany was the theater of scenes of devastation and horror such as have never been witnessed from that age to our own. Science, driven from the courts of kings and the palaces of bishops, took refuge in the monasteries. Many of the Scots, fleeing from the old seats of learning, were hospitably received at the monastery of *St. Gall*, whose mountainous position secured it at once against the hostile attacks of enemies and the moral depravity of the age. Their presence and energy gave an impulse to the earnest efforts on behalf of science and art, to which so much prominence was given under the abbots *Solomon I.* (A. D. 839–871) and *Solomon III.* (A. D. 890–920). The reputation which the monastery thus acquired drew to its walls numerous scholars desirous of gaining the knowledge that was there imparted.[1] Similar spirit and energy in the cause of science were displayed at the neighboring monasteries of *Reichenau* and *Hirschau*;[2] but, for all that, the bulk of the writers of name during the tenth century belonged to St. Gall. Such were *Eccehard I.*, who received special marks of recognition from the Emperor Otho I. and Pope John XII. for his excellent religious canticles; *Eccehard II.*, whom Otho, upon the recommendation of *Hedwig*, the widow of Burkhard, Duke of Suabia, a lady equally remarkable for austerity of life and cultivation of mind, invited to court to direct the studies of his son, Otho II.; and finally, the learned *Eccehard III.*, a relative of the preceding Eccehard, and Dean of St. Gall. The fame of the monastery of St. Gall was greatly increased by the vast and varied acquirement and splendid reputation of two of its scholars. These were the two *Notkers*—the one a physician (*Physicus*), an author of sacred hymns, a painter, and a musician; the other (*Labeo*), the most learned German of the tenth century, was gifted with a versatility of talent, and was equally eminent as a theologian, a musician, a poet, a mathematician, an astronomer, and a philologist.

---

[1] Cf. *Dümmler*, The Formulary of B. Solomon III., Lps. 1857; *the same*, Memorials of St. Gall, from the times of the Carlovingians, Lps. 1859.

[2] For details concerning all the following writers, see *Hefele's* Supplem. to Ch. H., where particulars may also be found on the *branches taught*, the *method of teaching*, and the *libraries* used.

One of the songs composed by Notker *Balbulus*, entitled "*Media Vita*," became very popular, and his work "*De Interpretibus Divinarum Scripturarum*" long remained a valuable guide to the students of theology. A large debt of gratitude is also due to him for having in a measure cast his mother-tongue into scientific form, for he was the first to employ it in the treatment of scientific subjects († A. D. 1022). At the close of the tenth and the opening of the eleventh century, the fame formerly enjoyed by the monastery of Reichenau as a seat of learning was again restored by the monks *Burkhard* and *Rupert*, both poets, and by *Herman* the *Decrepit*. *Regino* of *Prüm* († A. D. 915) and *Burkhard*, Bishop of Worms († A. D. 1025), made new collections of decretals.

In the year 910 was founded the monastery of *Clugny*, which became for a time the custodian, and, later on, the fosterer of learning in France. Among the causes which mainly contributed at this time to the progress of learning were the labors of the monasteries of Germany; the efforts of the Saxon Emperors in its behalf and their *taste for the creations of classical antiquity*, which had been awakened and cultivated by their intercourse with Constantinople; and the zeal of many holy bishops. To these must be added the influence of the Arabian schools at *Cordova* (after the year 980), where special attention was given to the study of the natural sciences.

Both *Hock* and *Hefele* have shown, not by general assertions or doubtful inferences, but by actual citation of facts and names, that the tenth century, so often called the Age of Iron, the Age of Lead, and the Dark Age, is far from being as black as it is usually represented. They have shown that it is very important to make a distinction between the first and second half of the century, and that to form a judgment of the whole from the character of either of its parts would be to commit a grave historical blunder.[1] Some idea of the mental culture of this century may be had from what we are told of the accomplished *Hroswitha* (Helena of Rossow, † A. D. 984), a nun of Gandersheim, who was an elegant Latin scholar—a language which, as she herself informs us, had been taught her *by ladies*—knew Greek moderately well, sang the exploits of Otho the Great in rhyming hexameters and wrote comedies in the style of Terence.[2]

We should not here omit mention of the *School of Liége*, founded by Bishop *Notker* († A. D. 1007), and by him placed under the direction of *Wazon*, a man in every way worthy of the charge, who afterward became Bishop of Liége. This school was styled by contemporaries the nursery of learning, because of the number of bishops and scholars who were trained within its walls.[3] Neither was *Italy* destitute of scholars during the tenth century. There was *Ratherius*, the austere Bishop of Verona and Liége († A. D. 974), who in his writings pursued the dissolute clergy of the age with vehement and relentless severity;[1] *Atto*, Bishop of *Vercelli* (from A. D. 945), who constantly lamented the relaxation of discipline;[2] and *Luitprand*, Bishop of Cremona (after A. D. 970), the author of a history containing a frightful picture of the depravity of the age; but the truthfulness of the statements given in this work is very much shaken by the looseness of his own life and his courtly servility.[3]

---

[1] Angelus Politianus, Laurentius Valla, and even Baronius, judging the whole Church by the deplorable condition of the Apostolic See, have unquestionably drawn too dark a picture of the tenth century. A more enlightened and favorable judgment has been passed upon these years by *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des auteurs ecclés., in the avertissement du siècle X.

[2] Carmina Ottonis I.: Comoediae sacrae VI. (opp. ed. *Schurzfleisch*, Vit. 1794, 4to, ed. *Barack*, Norimb. 1858; Comoed. VI., ed. *J. Bendixen*, Lubec. 1857. The letter alleged in *Mabillon*, Annal. Bened., T. III., p. 547, and in *Stengel*, Laud. Bened., p. 169, says of Hroswitha: *Graece* et Latine doctissima, oratores dicendi arte supergressa, poetarum sui temporis nulli inferior, etc. *Aschbach*, Roswitha and Conrad Celtes, Vienna, 1867, strangely questioned the genuineness of the works of Hroswitha, pretending that they were the fabrication of *Conrad Celtes*, who lived in the sixteenth century. As to the victorious refutation of *Barack*, *Ruland*, and *Köpke*, see *Reusch*, Bonn Theol. Revue, nro. 23, year 1869. Hroswitha's works in *Migne's* Ser. Lat., Vol. 137.

[3] Cf. Gesta episcopor. Leodiens. (*Martène* IV., p. 865.) **Alb. Thijm*, Vazon, évèque de Liége et son temps, Brux. 1862 (revue Belge et étrangère). *Höfler* German Popes, Pt. II., p. 381 sq.

Among the *French* writers of this century was Canon *Flodoard*, the author of a history of the Church of Rheims.[4] It is with feelings of pride that the historian mentions the name of *Gerbert*. In learning and finished scholarship, for which he was partly indebted to the Arabs, he was far in advance of his age.[5] A copious, original, and elegant writer, he was equally conversant with *mathematics*, *astronomy*, and *the natural sciences*, and with the *Bible*, the *Fathers*, and the *Sacred Canons*. These latter were the sources whence he drew the principles of his dogmatical, moral, and disciplinary teaching. He was so enamored of philosophy that he deemed it, equally with faith, a Divine gift. He was also a close student of rhetoric, and published a text-book on the subject. The fame of his marvelous learning reached the remotest corners of France and Germany, and raised the *School of Rheims* to a height of reputation which it was unable to sustain when he had passed away, and was never again able to reach. His name, his labors, and his zeal gave a fresh impulse to study and drew to his side a numerous and enthusiastic band of disciples († A. D. 1003). The most illustrious of these was *Fulbert of Chartres* († A. D. 1029), who, if he contributed little to science and literature by his own writings, has the honor and merit of having trained talented and accomplished scholars who contributed much. Another of the disciples of Gerbert was *Berengarius of Tours*, whom we shall again have occasion to mention when we come to speak of his discussion with *Lanfranc* (who became Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 1070) in the second controversy on the Eucharist. We have already seen how powerful an influence was exercised in Italy by *Peter Damian* in restoring the morals and discipline of the clergy. Trained in the austere discipline of the monastery of Fonte-Avellana, and in its severe and exact course of studies, he was specially fitted for this difficult task. His writings, which are chiefly directed against the simony and immorality of the priesthood, and are grave and ascetical in character, show an extensive knowledge of Holy Scriptures, of the writings of the Fathers, and of the Canons of the Church († A. D. 1072).[1]

---

[1] *Ratherius*, de contemptu canonum; apologia sui ipsius; de discordia inter ipsum et clericos; meditationum cordis s. praeloquior., libb. VI. and epp. IV. (Opp. edd. *Ballerini*, Veron. 1756, f.) Cf. *Engelhardt*, on Ratherius (Treatise of Church History, nro. 5). *Vogel*, Ratherius of Verona and the tenth Century, Jena, 1854.

[2] *Atto Vercell.*, de pressuris ecclesiast., libb. III.; collectio canonum; epp. XI. (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg. ed. II., T. I., in *Migne's* Ser. Lat., T. 134.)

[3] Cf. *Wattenbach*, Sources of the Hist. of Germ., 2d ed., p. 264. *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the City of Rome, Vol. III., pp. 273, 274.

[4] *Flodoardi* Historia Ecclesiae Rhemensis (in 948), ed. *Colvenerius*, Duaci, 1617. He also wrote a chronicon sive annales, from 877 to 966. (*Bouquet*, T. V., and in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 135.)

[5] For editions of his works, see above, p. 311, note 1. Conf. Histoire Litéraire de la France, T. VI., p. 577. *Hock*, Gerbert, or Pope Sylvester II. and his Age, Vienna, 1837. *Höfler*, German Popes, Pt. I., p. 85–88.

Side by side with the cloister-schools of *Fulda* and *Hildesheim*, there flourished in Northern Germany, during the first half of the eleventh century, the celebrated *school of Paderborn*, founded by Bishop *Meinwerk*[2] (A. D. 1009–1036). *Herman* of Reichenau, surnamed *Contractus*, on account of bodily deformity, is praised by *Trithemius*, a writer usually well informed, as a philosopher, an astronomer, a poet,[3] an orator, a musician, and a theologian of merit, and bore the reputation of being the greatest biblical scholar of his age—a reputation to which his knowledge of the Greek and Arabic languages contributed not a little.[1]

---

[1] Opera, Rom. 1606–1640; Venet. 1744, fol.; in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 144 and 145.

[2] In the *vita Meinwerci*, cap. XI., the busy, studious life there is poetically described thus: "Studiorum multiplicia sub eo floruere exercitia; quando ibi musici fuerunt et dialectici enituerunt, rhetorici clarique grammatici, quando magistri artium ibi exercebant trivium, quibus omne studium erat circa quadrivium. Ubi mathematici claruerunt et astronomici, habebantur physici atque geometrici. Viguit *Horatius* magnus atque *Virgilius*, *Crispus Sallustius* et urbanus *Statius*, ludusque fuit omnibus, insudare versibus et dictaminibus jucundisque cantibus." (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. Junii, T. I., p. 637.) Cf. †*Evelt*, Supplem. to the History of the state of the Studies and Instruction in the German and French Church of the eleventh century, Paderborn, 1856 sq. (Two Programmes.)

[3] Author of the *Salve regina* and *Alma redemptoris mater.*

After the death of the Emperor Henry III. (A. D. 1056), and Luitpold, Archbishop of Mentz (A. D. 1059), things took a turn for the worse. Study was neglected, law and equity violated, and morality outraged. But, in spite of such drawbacks, there were distinguished scholars in Germany during the second half of the eleventh century. There was the celebrated historian, *Lambert of Hersfeld*, who imitated successfully the classic elegance and purity of the great Latin authors. He brought his narrative down to the election of anti-king Rudolph, "in order," as he says, "that any one wishing to take up the subject after him may have a convenient point from which to start out." There was also *Othlo*, a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Emmeram, at Ratisbon (A. D. 1062), who, looking away off into the future, foretold the peculiar form which certain minds would give to mysticism as time went on.[2]

§ 204. *New Controversy on Predestination, Occasioned by the Teachings of Gottschalk.* (See Vol. I., p. 589.)

The writings of Ratramnus, Scot. Erigena, Lupus, Florus, Remigius, Prudentius, and confess. Gotteschalki. (*Mauguin.*,Vett. auctor. qui saec. IX. de praedest. et grat. scripserunt opp. et fragm., Par. 1650, 2 vol. 4to.) *Mansi*, T. XIV. et XV. *Harduin*, T. V. *Kunstmann*, The letters written by Rabanus Maurus in the controversy on Predestination (Hist. Polit. Revue, Vol. 52, p. 254 sq.)

Usserius, Gotteschalki et praedest. controv. hist., Dubl. 1631, 4to, Han. 1662. *Cellot*, Hist. Gotteschalki praedestinatiani, Par. 1655, f. *Mauguin*, Gotteschalki controv. hist. et chron. synops., Par. 1650, 4to. *Natalis Alex.* H. E. saec. IX. et X., diss. V. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., p. 124–213. *Kunstmann*, Rabanus Maurus, p. 119 sq. *Weizsäcker*, The dogma of Divine Predestination (Annuary of German Theology, 1859).

The monk Gottschalk, like the Gallic priest Lucidus, in a former age, misinterpreting the writings of *St. Augustine* and Fulgentius, put forth the most extravagant views on predestination. He was the son of *Berno*, a Saxon count, and had been from his earliest years destined by his parents to a cloistered life. Acting upon the authority of the teaching laid down by a council of Toledo, that one became a monk either by personal profession or by the promise of his parents (*monachum facit aut propria confessio aut paterna devotio*), they forced him against his will to take the monastic vows in presence of Rabanus Maurus, abbot of the monastery of Fulda.

---

[1] *Trithem.* de Scriptor. Ecc., cap. 321. Cf. *Hefele*, Supplem., Vol. I., pp. 312, 313.

[2] *Othlonis* lib. visionum, de cursu spirituali; de trib. quaest. (*Pez.* Thesaur., T. III., in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 146.)

In the year 829, a synod held at Mentz under the presidency of Archbishop *Otgar* took his case under consideration and released him from the obligations he had taken upon himself; but the abbot Rabanus Maurus appealed to the Emperor, Louis the Mild, who decided that Gottschalk should keep to his former engagement. These circumstances made a residence at Fulda in many ways disagreeable to the young Saxon, and, passing across to France, he entered the monastery of *Orbais*, in the diocese of Soissons. Ill at ease in a mode of life not of his own choosing and at variance with his tastes and disposition, and smarting under the recollection of the harsh treatment he had received from Rabanus Maurus, he sought distraction from his own thoughts by plunging into the study of SS. Augustine and Fulgentius. He soon built up a system of predestination, which, though entirely at variance with the spirit and drift of St. Augustine's teachings, was nevertheless supported by some of his boldest utterances.

According to Gottschalk, there is a twofold predestination (gemina praedestinatio), by virtue of which God foreordains some to eternal *life* and others to eternal *death*. It is not, said he, the will of God that *all* should be saved, but *only* the *elect*, who alone are the objects of His merciful redemption. As the elect can not but be saved, so neither can the reprobate help being damned. For these latter the Sacraments are but empty forms and idle ceremonies. Baptism is powerless to unite them in fellowship with Christ, or to make them of the body of His Church. Since the Fall, man enjoys only the *liberty of doing evil and committing sin*.

While the language of Gottschalk, which is at times harsh and aggressive, sufficiently bears out the scheme of predestination imputed to him by his opponents, it is still quite possible that he was more orthodox in thought than expression. While returning, in the year 847, from a pilgrimage to Rome, Gottschalk stopped at a hospice erected by Eberhard, Count of Friuli, for the accommodation of pilgrims, and while here proposed and explained his new system to his hosts, to the count, and to *Noting*, the newly elected Bishop of Verona. Not long after, Bishop Noting met Rabanus Maurus, who had recently been elected Archbishop of Mentz (A. D. 847), at the court of Louis the Mild, and told him of the doctrines of Gottschalk, and how he himself had been startled by their novelty and boldness. Rabanus promised to write a refutation of them at once, which he did in two tracts—the one addressed to Bishop Noting, and the other to Count Eberhard. In these answers he draws a broad and clear distinction between God's *foreknowledge* and His *predestination*—between those predestined to eternal life and those whom God foreknows will not be saved. He constantly insists on this distinction, and maintains that the relation of God to the reprobate is properly expressed by the word "foreknowledge;" i. e., that they are themselves the instruments of their own perdition, and that God, foreknowing that they would be wicked, predestined everlasting punishment to them, not them to everlasting punishment. And, appealing to Prosper as authority for the statement, he says: "God did not predestine nor withdraw from the number of the reprobate those whom He *foreknew* would be sinners."

Gottschalk, after reading the letter of Rabanus to Bishop Noting, expressed surprise that he should be accused of erroneous teaching, and, in a reply, retorted upon Rabanus by charging him with holding the errors of semi-Pelagianism. He returned to Germany, and assisted at a great *synod* convoked at *Mentz* (A. D. 848) by the archbishop, to consider the question in the presence of King Louis. The synod, after having taken up and discussed the teachings of Gottschalk and Rabanus, declared those of the former heretical and those of the latter clear of any such taint. As Gottschalk refused to give up and retract his errors, he was sent back to his metropolitan, Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, with a letter from the synod, drawn up by Archbishop Rabanus. Hincmar treated him with considerable severity. As Gottschalk, on being summoned before the *Council* of *Chiersy* (Quiercy, or Crécy on the Oise), held in the year 849, not only refused to retract his doctrines, but boldly and obstinately defended them, he was himself adjudged guilty of contempt of his lawful superiors and of obstinate adherence to his errors, and his teachings condemned as heretical. He was sentenced to corporal punishment and to confinement for life in the monastery of Hautvilliers, in the diocese of Rheims. During this confinement Gottschalk drew up two confessions of faith in defense of his system of predestination, to which he steadily adhered, to the last hour of his life, and died (A. D. 868) without becoming reconciled to the Church.

But his teachings lived after him, and the history of his life excited both interest and sympathy. Some said that the treatment of him had been unnecessarily and excessively harsh,[1] while others attacked both Rabanus Maurus and Hincmar for having done violence to the teaching of St. Augustine and for having favored semi-Pelagianism. Gottschalk had accused Hincmar of rashness for taking exception to the expression "*Te trina Deitas*" in the hymn of the Church belonging to the office common to martyrs.[2] The new doctrines were taken up and warmly defended by *Ratramnus*, a monk of Corbie; *Remigius*, Archbishop of Lyons; *Prudentius*, Bishop of Troyes; and *Lupus*, Abbot of Ferrières, one of the ablest and most elegant writers of his age. They were combated with equal warmth and energy by *Rabanus*, *Pardulus*, Bishop of Laon, and *Hincmar*. The last-named persuaded *Scotus Erigena* to take part in the controversy; but this bold and reckless thinker, by attacking the system of Gottschalk in its philosophical rather than in its theological bearings, opened up a wide and dangerous field of controversy, and was himself hotly assailed by *Arnold*, Archbishop of Lyons, and by *Florus*, the *master* of the cathedral-schools in the same city.[1]

---

[1] *Hincmar*, in a defense of his conduct, could cite only the rule of St. Benedict, where it said: "Indisciplinatos et inquietos durius arguendos—vel corporis castigatione—coërcendos esse." And again, can. 3 of the Council of Agde: "In monachis quoque par praesentis sententiae forma servetur, quodsi *verborum increpatio non emendaverit*, etiam *verberibus* statuimus *coërceri*."

[2] *Hincmar* took *deïtas* as expressing divine substance or essence, which indeed is but *one*, while *trinitas* refers simply to the persons. His idea, then, was *orthodox;* but he overlooked the circumstance, that *Deïtas* was usually taken as identical with *Deus* (not sensu strictiori = substantia divina), wherefore the above expression was not open to reprehension.

Hincmar, perceiving that his opponents were growing daily more numerous and violent, resolved to end the controversy by an appeal to ecclesiastical authority. Accordingly he laid the matter before the *second Synod of Chiersy* (A. D. 853), which taking the four propositions of the archbishop (4 Capitula Carisiacensia) as a basis, decreed—1. That there is but *one* predestination; 2. That the *free will* of man, before it is capable of doing good, requires preventing or antecedent and assisting grace; 3. That God will have *all* men to be saved; and, 4. That Christ died for *all* men.[2]

---

[1] He was "Magister" at the Cathedral school of Lyons († about 860), and first animadverted upon the false theological views of Scotus: Qui velut de praescientia et de praedestinatione divina *humanis*, et ut ipse gloriatur, *philosophicis argumentationibus* disputans, nulla ratione reddita sive scripturarum sive St. Patrum auctoritate praelata velut sequenda et tenenda, *sua sola praesumptione* definire ausus est. (Bibl. max., T. XV.) In matter of fact, Erigena was still reproached with the following errors: 1. Praescientiam et praedestinationem Dei unum et idem esse; 2. Praedestinationem et praescientiam Dei esse essentiam sicuti voluntatem, sapientiam, etc. 3. The *definition:* Praedestinatio divina est lex omnium naturarum aeterna et immutabilis disciplina. 4. That, as sin was but a μὴ ὄν (a nonentity), God could not predestinate the sinner to hell, or positively punish him; that, therefore, damnation consisted only in the torturing consciousness of having missed one's destination.

[2] Deus elegit ex massa perditionis, secundum praescientiam suam, quos per gratiam praedestinavit ad vitam; et vitam illis praedestinavit aeternam. Caeteros autem, quos justitiae judicio in massa perditionis reliquit, *perituros praescivit*, sed non, ut perirent, praedestinavit. Poenam autem illis, quia *justus* est, praedestinavit aeternam. Ac per hoc *unam* Dei praedestinationem tantummodo dicimus, quae aut ad donum pertinet gratiae, aut ad retributionem justitiae. Habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum, praeventum et adjutum gratia; et habemus liberum arbitrium ad malum, desertum gratia. Liberum autem habemus arbitrium, quia gratia liberatum et gratia de corrupto sanatum. — Deus *omnes* homines sine exceptione vult salvos fieri, licet non omnes salventur: quod autem quidam salvantur, salvantis est donum; quod autem quidam pereunt, pereuntium est meritum. — Nullus est, fuit vel erit homo, pro quo (Christus) passus non fuerit, licet non omnes passionis ejus mysterio redimantur. Quod vero omnes passionis ejus mysterio non redimuntur, non respicit ad mag-

The controversy continued some time longer, but was confined chiefly to the use of terms. At the Councils of *Valence* (A. D. 855) and *Langres* (A. D. 859) an attempt was made by Remegius, Archbishop of Lyons, and other defenders of the Gottschalkian system, to have the doctrine of double predestination made a dogma of faith; and, as a part of the plan, the *Four Capitula* were entirely misrepresented, and the writings of Erigena condemned as containing absurd and foolish errors.

The decrees of this synod were sent to Pope *Nicholas I.* for his approval, which he declined to give, and prudently kept aloof from the quarrel.

The controversy was finally brought to a close at the national Synod of *Tousy* (A. D. 860), in the diocese of Toul, composed of fifty-seven bishops from the fourteen French provinces, by the adoption, without much debate, of the conclusions of the second and larger work of Hincmar, entitled "*De Praedestinatione*," as the basis of settlement.

§ 205. *First Controversy on the Eucharist—Paschasius Radbert.*

Paschasius Radbertus, de corp. et sang. Domini s. de sacrament., first edition, 1831, revised ed. 1844 (*Martène* et *Durand*, Coll. ampl., T. IX.), Epist. ad Frudegard. et ad Carol. Calv. and Expositio in Matt. xxvi. 26, and in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 120. *Rabani Mauri* ep. ad Heribald. s. poenitentiale, cap. 33. (*Mabill.* vett. Anaclet., ed. II., p. 17, and *Canisii* Lect. Ant, T. II., Pt. II., p. 311, in *Migne's* Ser. Lat., T. 112.) *Dicta cujusd. sapient.* (according to *Mabillon Rab. Mauri*) de corp. et sang. Dom. (*Mabill.* Acta SS. O. St. Ben. saec. IV., T. I., p. 591.) *Ratramnus*, de corp. et sang. Dom. ad Carol. Reg. ed. *Boileau*, Par. 1712. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 121. Anonymus Cellotianus (*Gerbertus*), de corp. et sang. Domini (*Pez*, Anecdot., T. I., Pt. II., p. 131–146).

Histoire litéraire de France, T. V., p. 287, and *Natal. Alex.* H. E. saec. IX. et X., diss. X. *Hausherr*, *S.J.*, St. Paschasius Radbertus, Mentz, 1862. See Tübg. Quart. 1863, p. 359 sq. *Reuter*, de Erroribus, qui aetate media doctrinam Christianam de st. Eucharistia turbaverunt, Berol. 1840.

The doctrine of the Real Presence and of Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Eucharist had been the universal and unvarying belief of the Catholic Church from the ear-

---

nitudinem et pretii copiositatem, sed ad infidelium et ad non credentium ea fide, quae per dilectionem operatur, respicit partem. *Mansi*, T. XIV., p. 920. *Harduin*, T. V., p. 18.

liest day of her foundation. Other doctrines were called in question; this never. It had never been a subject of controversy, because the steady and uniform faith with which it was held had never been disturbed. This, and other reasons equally obvious,[1] will account for the absence of any special controversial reference to the doctrine in the Fathers of the Church and ecclesiastical writers anterior to the ninth century. They did not make it a particular subject of discussion, because there was no call upon them to defend it against the objections of adversaries.

Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and, after the year 844, the abbot of the monastery of Corbie († A. D. 865), was the first to write (A. D. 831) a specific and comprehensive treatise on the Eucharist, intended for the use of the students of the monastery of New-Corvey, recently founded in Saxony. His only object in this work was to lay before his readers a simple statement of the faith of the universal Church on the Eucharist. Radbert got out a second edition of the work in 844, which was considerably enlarged by the addition of some startling views advanced by *Haymo* of Halberstadt and *Amalarius* of Metz, and in this form dedicated it to Charles the Bald.

In order the better to understand the drift of the controversy to which the publication of Paschasius' treatise gave occasion, it will be necessary to state briefly in advance *the teachings of the earlier Doctors of the Church, as gathered from their occasional utterances concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist*, that we may thus be in a better position to judge whether Radbert was in accord or disagreement with them on the question. Their opinions may be classified as follows:

I. Some viewed the Sacrament of the Eucharist as immediately and intimately connected with the Incarnation. They call it the *Body of Christ, which was born of Mary*, and which suffered and died for us. They take these words in their literal sense, and reject any sort of symbolical or figurative explanation of them. Adopting the language of the Apostolic Father, *St. Ignatius*, they brand such as deny the actual Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist as out-and-out heretics.

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 726.

II. Others draw a distinction between *the external forms and appearances* of bread and wine and the internal substance or essence. They use, in drawing out this distinction, such terms as image, figure, and sign (imago, figura, signum).

III. Others give special prominence to the *spiritual* sense in which the Body and Blood are eaten and drunk; speak of Christ as being present in the Sacrament in some mysterious way or manner, and refer, as an instance of their meaning, to the example of Christ, who, when instituting the Sacrament of the Last Supper, held Himself in His hands.

Paschasius based his exposition of the Eucharist on the teaching of these early Fathers, but particularly on that of *St. John Damascene*[1] and *St. Ambrose*.[2] He drew out the doctrine of the Church with accuracy and fullness, but in terms which have now passed out of use and are liable to be misunderstood,[3] insisting particularly on the following points:

---

[1] *Joan. Damasc.* de Fide orthod. IV. 13: *Σῶμά ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ἡνωμένον θεότητι τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου σῶμα, οὐχ ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ ἀναληφθὲν σῶμα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατέρχεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος μεταποιοῦνται εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα θεοῦ.* (Opp. ed. *le Quien.*, Ven. 1734, T. I., p. 269 sq.)

[2] *Ambros.* de Mysteriis, lib. I., c. 9, n. 53: Si ordinem quaerimus, viro mixta femina generare consuevit. Liquet igitur, quod praeter naturae ordinem virgo generavit. Et hoc quod conficimus corpus ex Virgine est: quid hic quaeris naturae ordinem in Christi corpore, cum praeter naturam sit ipse dominus Jesus partus ex Maria virgine? Vera utique caro Christi, quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est; vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. (Opp. ed. *Bened.*, T. II., p. 339.)

[3] Nullus moveatur de hoc corpore Christi et sanguine, quod in mystico vera sit caro et verus sit sanguis, dum sic voluit ille qui creavit. Omnia enim quaecunque voluit fecit in coelo et in terra: et quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini maneat, haec sic esse omnino, nihilque aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt; et ut mirabilius loquar, non alia plane (caro), quam quae nata est de Maria et passa in cruce, *et resurrexit de sepulcro*, cap. I. Quia *Christum vorari fas dentibus non est*, voluit in mysterio hunc panem et vinum vere carnem suam et sanguinem *consecratione spiritus st. potentialiter creari*, creando vere quotidie *mystice immolari:* ut sicut de virgine per spiritum st. vera caro sine coitu creatur, ita per eundem ex *substantia* panis et vini *mystice* idem Christi corpus et sanguis *consecretur*, cap. IV. — In hoc Christi verbo "hoc est corpus meum" *creatur* illud corpus, quia divinum verbum est. In hoc verbo "hic est calix sanguinis mei" sanguis *efficitur*, quod *antea* vinum et aqua *fuerat*, cap. XV. — Ideo haec mysteria *non carnalia*, licet caro et sanguis sint,

1. The Presence of the *true Body and Blood of Christ* in the Sacrament of the altar.

2. The firm belief that the bread and wine, after the act of consecration, though still retaining the forms and appearances of bread and wine, are in very truth the *Flesh* and *Blood of Christ.*

3. *The fact*, which, as he said, must seem still more marvelous, *that this Flesh is none other than that which Christ took in the womb of the Virgin Mary, which was born of her, in which He suffered for us on the Cross, and in which He rose again from the dead.*

Paschasius states, in his *Explanation of Matthew* xxvi. 26, that one great object of his treatise on the Eucharist was to bring home to the minds of the *boys* studying in the monastery the truth of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar; that, with this object steadily before his thoughts, he had been at special pains to bring prominently forward the truth that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist was *identical* with that which was born of Mary, and was crucified and *rose* again from the dead; that, though the substance (veritas) and the form (figura) exist together in the Eucharist, he had no intention of ignoring, much less denying, that there were *formal* differences between them, or of asserting that the form and appearance of the natural Body of Christ were the *same* as the form and appearance of His Body in the Eucharist. He explicitly rejected the grossly carnal doctrine of the Capharnaites,[1] which had been unjustly imputed to him.

The adversaries of Paschasius, while accusing him of teaching that the recipient apprehended the Body and Blood of Christ by the carnal sense of taste, endeavored to show that there were properties special to the Body of Christ in the Eucharist not possessed by the natural Body of Christ while on earth. They appealed to the writings of *St. Jerome* and

---

sed spiritualia jure intelliguntur. *Frivolum est ergo,* sicut in apocrypho libro legitur, *cogitare de stercore,* ne commisceatur digestione alterius cibi, cap. XX.

[1] The name of a sect, who, reasoning from John vi. 52, 59, put a gross and material interpretation upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation. (Tr.)

St. Augustine to establish a *distinction* between the sacramental, the natural, and the mystical Body (the Church) of Christ. The Body of Christ in the Eucharist, said they, is in substance (*naturaliter*) identical with the Body taken from the womb of Mary, but different in form and appearance (*specialiter*). These views were advocated by certain anonymous writers and by *Rabanus Maurus*, Archbishop of Mentz.

But Radbert's most determined opponent was a monk of his own monastery, by name *Ratramnus* († A. D. 866), who remained for a long time unknown. He maintained that a distinction should be made between the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament and the presence which came within the domain of the senses; that the Sacrament consisted of two parts, viz., the figure or form (*figura, imago*) and that to which the figure or form belongs, or the substance of the Sacrament (*veritas, res sacramenti*). Hence he insisted that there was a *difference* of *form* and *appearance* between the natural and the Eucharistic Body of Christ, and that the form by which the latter is apprehended through the senses is not not its own, but that of bread and wine.

With the exception of the above points, Ratramnus, in his treatment of the question, is *very obscure;* and this obscurity clings to him, whether engaged in refuting an adversary or establishing his own position. He accuses his opponents of maintaining that there is no distinction whatever between the outward appearance of the Sacrament, or that which falls under the senses, and its essence; that it appears to the senses as it is in fact, and is not hidden under any outward veil; that that which is visible to sense is identical with that which is visible to faith; and that consequently there is no call for an exercise of faith in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.[1]

---

[1] Ille panis, qui per sacerdotis ministerium Christi corpus efficitur, aliud *exterius* humanis sensibus ostendit, et aliud *interius* fidelium mentibus clamat. Panis ille vinumque figurate Christi corpus et sanguis existit. — Christi corpus et sanguis non sunt idem, quod *cernuntur* et quod *creduntur*. Secundum enim quod cernuntur, corpus pascunt corruptibile, ipsa corruptibilia; secundum vero quod creduntur, animas pascunt in aeternum victuras, ipsa immortalia. — *Differunt autem a se species et veritas.* Quapropter corpus et sanguis, quod in ecclesia

In attempting to explain the constituents of the Sacrament, Ratramnus appears at times to admit that the substance of the bread is changed into the Body of Christ by the words of consecration; but he also appears to maintain that the Divine Word or Logos takes the place of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament and nourishes the soul; and even goes the length of asserting that the Israelites received the Body of Christ in the manna—a view explicitly condemned by Christ Himself (John vi.) In presence of such facts as these, the efforts of *Boileau* and *Natalis Alexander* to prove that the work of Ratramnus contains no dogmatical errors can not be regarded as satisfactory.[1]

---

geritur, differt ab illo corpore et sanguine, quod in Christi corpore *per resurrectionem jam glorificatum* cognoscitur. Et hoc corpus pignus est et veritas, illud vero ipsa veritas. — Videmus itaque multa differentia separari mysterium sanguinis et corporis Christi, quod nunc a fidelibus sumitur in ecclesia, et illud quod natum est de Maria virgine, quod passum, quod sepultum, quod surrexit, quod coelos ascendit, quod ad dexteram Patris sedet. — But Ratramn argued further: Dicunt, quod nulla sub figura, nulla sub elevatione fiat, sed ipsius veritas nuda manifestatione peragatur. (Sed) si figurate nihil hic accipiatur, sed totum in veritate conspiciatur: *nihil hic fides operatur.* Nam si videres, diceres, *video*, non diceres, *credo*, corpus sanguinemque esse Christi. Nunc autem quia *fides* totum, quidquid illud est, aspicit, et oculus carnis nihil apprehendit, intellige, quod non in *specie*, sed in *virtute* corpus et sanguis Christi existant, quae cernuntur. — Et sicut *non corporaliter*, sed *spiritualiter* panis ille credentium corpus dicitur: sic quoque Christi corpus non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter necesse est intelligatur. — Igitur si vinum illud sanctificatum per ministrorum officium in Christi sanguinem corporaliter convertitur: aqua quoque, quae pariter admista est, in sanguinem populi credentis necesse est corporaliter convertatur. — At videmus in aqua secundum corpus nihil esse conversum. Consequenter ergo et in vino nihil corporaliter ostensum. Accipitur spiritualiter, quidquid in aqua de populi corpore significatur. *Accipiatur ergo necesse est spiritualiter, quidquid in vino de Christi sanguine intimatur.* Notwithstanding the efforts of Natalis Alexander to put an orthodox interpretation upon the words of this author, his meaning is still very doubtful, and may be understood as implying no more than a Presence, which, *dependent on the faith* of the individual, is still a means of bringing him to the knowledge of Christ Jesus in the Eucharist. Still, the Magdeburg Centuriators held that the work of Ratramnus *transsubstantiationis* habet semina; utitur enim vocabulis *commutationis* et *conversionis*.

[1] See the history of this work, edited by *Boileau*, Par. 1712, in *Mabillon*, Acta ordin. St. Bened. saec. IV., Pt. II., p. 8 sq.; in *Du Pin*, Bibl., siècle IX., and in the Book of Ratramn, etc., Oxford, 1838. The author, at the request of Charles the Bald, answers two questions: utrum aliquid secreti contineat, quod oculis

Servatus Lupus, after examining the doctrine of Ratramnus, pronounced many things in it to be of doubtful orthodoxy; *Florus*, Master of the School of Lyons, made an attempt to clear up the difficulties, and, where that was not possible, to explain them away; and *Scotus Erigena*, at the request of Charles the Bald, unfortunately engaged in the controversy, and, yielding to his tendency for the allegorizing method, explained everything in a superficial and rationalistic sense, and so attenuated the dogma of the Eucharist that in his hands it ceased to be more than a holy symbol and solemn memorial[1]

---

fidei solummodo pateat — et utrum ipsum corpus sit, quod de Maria natum est et passum?

[1] *Scoti Erig.* de Euchar., lib. (?), attacked already in the year 870 by Adrevaldus, monk of Fleury, in his work, De corpore et sanguine Christi ctr. ineptias Joan. Scoti (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 150). Hincmar. de Praedest., c. 31, accuses him: "Quod sacramenta altaris non verum corpus et verus sanguis sit Domini, sed tantum memoria veri corporis et sanguinis ejus," etc., and in the ep. Ascelini ad Bereng.: "Joan. Scotum toto nisu totaque mente ad hoc solum tendere video, ut mihi persuadeat, hoc videlicet, quod in altari consecratur, *neque vere corpus, neque vere sanguinem esse*," etc., in *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 775. The treatise of Erigena, to which Berengarius referred, was condemned by a synod of Paris, and by the councils of *Vercelli* (A. D. 1050) and *Rome* (A. D. 1059), and having been burnt in consequence, has not come down to us. But, since the publication of Erigena's commentary on the work of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, entitled *Hierarchia Coelestis*, edited by *Floss*, there is no longer any question as to the views of Erigena on the Eucharist (*Joan. Scoti* opera, ed. *Floss*, pp. 140, 141). Sequitur "et in unum principationis ipsam divinissimae eucharistiae assumptionem." Intuere quam pulcre, quam expresse asserit: *visibilem hanc eucharistiam*, quam quotidie sacerdotes ecclesiae in altari conficiunt ex sensibili materia panis et vini, quamque confectam et sanctificatam corporaliter accipiunt: *typicam esse similitudinem spiritualis principationis Jesu*, quam fideliter *solo intellectu* gustamus, h. e. intelligimus inque nostrae naturae interiora viscera sumimus ad nostram salutem et spirituale incrementum et *ineffabilem deificationem*. Oportet ergo, inquit, humanum animum ex sensibilibus rebus in coelestium virtutum similitudinem et aequalitatem ascendentem arbitrari, divinissimam eucharistiam visibilem in ecclesia conformatam maxime typum esse participationis ipsius, qua et nunc participamus Jesum per fidem et in futuro participabimus per speciem, eique adunabimur per caritatem. Quid ergo ad hanc magni theologi Dionysii praeclarissimam tubam respondent, qui visibilem eucharistiam *nihil aliud significare praeter se ipsam* volunt asserere, dum clarissima tuba praefata clamat, *non illa sacramenta visibilia colenda neque pro veritate amplexanda*, quia significativa veritatis sunt, neque propter se ipsa inventa, quoniam in ipsis intelligentiae finis non est, sed propter incomprehensibilem veritatis virtutem, quae Christus est, in unitate humanae divinaeque suae substantiae ultra omne, quod sensu sentitur corporeo, super omne, quod virtute percipitur

(*memoria corporis et sanguinis Christi*) of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Amalarius, a priest of Metz, gave still greater offense by his treatment of the question. Starting with a proposition, which is in itself true and not of unfrequent occurrence in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, to the effect that the Body of our Lord in the Eucharist is food and nourishment, not alone for the soul of man, but for the body also, he went on to deduce from this that the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, when received by man, is subject to the same laws of decomposition, assimilation, and excretion as other food taken into the human system. A doctrine so revolting outraged the religious feelings of Christians, and was branded with the opprobrious name of *Stercoranism*.[1] But, revolting as it was, even Rabanus Maurus, toward the close of his life, was accused of favoring it.[2]

---

intelligentiae Deus invisibilis in utraque sua natura." An attempt has been made to show, by the quotations from the Areopagite, made by Erigena, and, above all, by the expression, "ineffabilis deificatio," that Erigena, notwithstanding his equivocal expressions, saw incomparably much more in the Eucharist than the later heretics, Berengarius, Zwinglius, and Calvin. But as to Erigena's appeal to the Areopagite, *Hugo* a St. Victore (opp. ed. Rothom., T. I., p. 482) says: Sane hoc notandum, quod *quidam* et *hoc loco* (the words quoted from the Areop.) munimentum erroris sui ducere putaverunt dicentes, in sacramento altaris veritatem corporis et sanguinis Christi non esse, sed *imaginem* illius tantum et *figuram*. Hence, not much capital can be made of the expression, "*ineffabilis deificatio*," as against the positive testimony of *Hincmar* and the Epist. Ascelini ad Berengarium.

[1] *Matth. Pfaff.* diss. de Stercoranistis med. aevi tam Latin. quam Graec., Tüb. 1750, 4to. (The author is rather too liberal with his accusations of Stercoranism.)

[2] Viz., in his weak and obscure answer to a question on this subject, proposed to him by Heribald, Bishop of Auxerre: "Quod interrogastis, utrum eucharistia postquam consumitur, et *in secessum emittitur*, more aliorum ciborum iterum redeat in naturam pristinam, quam habuerat, antequam in altari consecraretur?" To this Rabanus made the following answer: "Superflua est hujusmodi quaestio, cum ipse salvator dixerit in evangelio: omne quod intrat in os, in ventrem vadit, et in secessum emittitur" (Matt. xv. 17). "Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis, i. e. ex rebus visibilibus et corporalibus conficitur; sed invisibilem tam corporis quam animae efficit sanctificationem et salutem. Quae est enim ratio, ut hoc, quod stomacho, digeritur et in secessum emittitur, iterum in statum pristinum redeat, cum nullus hoc unquam fieri asseruerit?" (*Canisii* Lect. Antiq., T. II., Pt. II., p. 311.) Rabanus might indeed have expressed his thought

A want of clearness, an indistinctness of ideas, and an indefiniteness in terms, are faults common to the writers on both sides of this controversy, from its rise to its close; but, notwithstanding this vagueness, it is certainly somewhat remarkable that no controversialist on either side impugned either the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar or the doctrine of Transsubstantiation. The scope of the discussion was strictly confined to *the mode of Christ's Presence* and *the manner in which the change of substance was brought about.* On these points, however, the writers on both sides went to extremes, or were, rather, led to them when their respective lines of reasoning were carried on to their logical conclusions; and the results at which they arrived prove how hazy and unscientific were their views on the Blessed Sacrament. One party, of which Amalarius may be taken as the representative, gave such prominence to the material elements of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist as to totally destroy its spirituality; while the other, whose representative was Scotus Erigena, so spiritualized the Body of Christ that the matter of the Sacrament (*res sacramenti*) was reasoned away till all that was left was but an outward appearance or shadow destitute of all reality. *Gerbert,* who afterward ascended the papal throne under the name of Sylvester II., summing up this controversy, in his work on the Eucharist, classifies the different parties to which it gave rise under the following heads: 1. The Stercoranists, whose position was wholly untenable; 2. Those who held, with *Radbertus*, that the Body of Christ received in the Eucharist is identical with that born of the Virgin Mary; 3. The opponents of Radbert, who held that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is not in all respects identical with His natural Body. Gerbert himself taught that there is no essential difference between the last two opinions; for, said he, the Body of Christ in the Sacrament and that born of the Virgin Mary are essentially (*naturaliter*) *one* and *the same;* while, on the other hand, there may be

---

in a more simple and, at the same time, more correct way, if he had said: Only common food—as Christ already said in St. Matt. xv. 17—is subject to the laws of nature. Here, there is no common food; hence, there can be no question of the consequences of the natural laws.

modes of existence (*modus existendi*) special (*specialiter*) to one and not to the other; so that, being identical in essence, there may nevertheless be aspects in which they *differ*.

To those who found fault with Paschasius for applying the words *figure* (figura) and *truth* (veritas) to the Sacrament of the altar, he replied that the words were quite appropriate—*figure* signifying that which falls under the senses, and *truth* that which is apprehended by faith.

To the third charge brought against Paschasius, viz., that Christ is crucified again as often as Mass is said (*totiens Christum pati quotiens missas contingat cotidie celebrari*), he replied that no such words were to be found in the writings of Paschasius; that his adversaries had drawn the inference from words used by him to express the identity of the Body of Christ on the altar with that on the Cross (*in altari et in cruce*), and that Paschasius himself had protested against such an imputation.[1] Gerbert adds these words:[2] "It would be wrong to imagine that there is anything false, deceptive, or of little account in the Mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ, since there bread and wine are changed into what they were not, by the Divine blessing and the power of the Word of God."

The words of *Lessing*, whose work is referred to at the head of the following paragraph, contain an admirable argument against the constant and persistent assertion of Protestants, that *Transubstantiation* was not a doctrine of the Church until after the time of Paschasius, by whose labors it became so.

"If it be true," says he, "as Zwinglius asserts, that the doctrine of *merely external signs* was the primitive and original doctrine of the Church, how was it possible that it should suddenly have given rise to the doctrine of Transubstantiation? Would not this have been a dangerous leap in the dark, such as the human reason never takes, even in its most unaccountable wanderings from the truth? And, in order to avoid taking it, should we not in our own case have approached the doctrine of Transubstantiation by a more consistent, if less direct course? Should we not have gone on from merely external signs to *pregnant signs*, as we will call them for the sake of brevity, or to such as are full of meaning and hidden virtue? And, having assumed this much, we should then have passed from signs to *reality*. The process would then be this: First came the belief in *merely external signs;* next, the belief in *signs possessing a virtue;* and finally, a *substituting for any sign whatever* the *reality* or *the thing itself.* Now the question arises, how did it come about that the transition was made from the first to the second stage without exciting comment or being the occasion of a controversy, while the transition from the *second* to the *third*, effected, as we are told, by Paschasius, was the occasion of much trouble and quarreling? This is the more remarkable, since the former would have been more offensive than the latter to the faith and religious feelings of the people. Now, as it is absolutely certain that the first leap in this supposed course of intellectual gymnastics was not the occasion of either protest or controversy, it is but natural to infer that no such course ever took place at all, and that the doctrine of the Church was from the beginning what it is to-day."

---

[1] In the epist. ad Frudegard., Paschasius says: Haec victima nobis mortem Unigeniti per *mysterium* reparat, qui licet surgens a mortuis jam *non moritur* tamen, in seipso *immortaliter atque incorruptibiliter vivens*, pro nobis iterum in hoc mysterio sacrae oblationis immolatur. Hinc pensemus, quale sit pro nobis sacrificium, quod pro absolutione nostra passionem Unigeniti filii semper *imitetur*.

[2] His expressions are: *Figura est*, dum panis et vinum extra videtur, *veritas* autem, dum et sanguis Christi in veritate interius creditur. — In mysterio corporis et sanguinis Christi, quod virtute coelestis benedictionis et verbi divini in id, quod non erat, consecratur, nihil falsum, nihil frivolum, nihil infidum sentiamus. Cf. *Hock*, Gerbert, p. 166–169.

This reasoning will acquire the full force of positive proof when it is recollected that there are historical facts which go to show that if there was one thing of which the faithful were more suspicious than of another, it was the introduction of any new dogma or teaching. Thus, for example, they indignantly protested against those who denied the divinity of Christ; rose in tumult when an attempt was made at Constantinople to abolish the use of the expression "*Mother of God;*" and obstinately resisted the substitution of the word *hedera* for *cucurbita*, the one to which they were accustomed, in a new translation of Jonas iv. 6.

§ 206. *Second Controversy on the Eucharist, Occasioned by the Writings of Berengarius of Tours.*

I. *Lanfranci* lib. de Euchar. sacr. ctr. Berengar. (1063–1070), Bas. 1528, and oftener (Opp. ed. *d'Achéry*, Par. 1684, f., ed. *Giles*, Oxon. 1844 sq., 2 V., and in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 150). *Hugo*, Episcop. Lingonens. (Langres), Tractatus de corpore et sanguine Christi. *Deoduinus*, Episcop. Leodiens. ep. ad Regem. *Durandus*, Abb. Troarnens., de corp. et sang. Christi. *Guitmundi*, Archiep. Aversani, de corp. et sang. Christi veritate in Eucharistia, lib. VIII. (collected in Max. Bibl. SS. PP., T. XVIII.; Bibl. Patr. Col., T. XI.) *Berengar.* lib. de s. coena ctr. Lanfranc. lib. posterior. (edition announced by *Stäudlin*, and partly published in six programmes, Götting. 1820 sq.), complete, but very incorrect, edition by *A. F.* and *T. Th. Vischer*, Berol. 1834; fit for use only with the Appendix by *Grotefend*, written down already by *Schönemann*, head librarian of the ducal library at Wolfenbüttel. The Acts in *Mansi*, T. XIX. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I. *Adelmanni* de Verit. corp. et sanguin. Dom. ep. ad Bereng. (Bibl. PP. Colon., T. XI., p. 348; Max. Bibl., T. XVIII., p. 438), most complete ed., *C. A. Schmidt*, Brunsv. 1770. *Bernaldus* Constant. (1088), de Bereng. multipl. condemnatione. (*Matth. Riberer*, Raccolta Ferrarese di opuscoli scientifici, Venez. 1789, T. XXI.) *Sudendorf*, Berengarius Turonensis, a collection of letters (22) referring to him, Hamb. 1850.

II. *Roye*, Vita, haeresis et poenitentia Bereng., Andegavi, 1656. *Mabillon*, de Multiplici Ber. damnat. (Analect., T. II.) *Lessing*, Berengarius of Tours, Brunsvick, 1770. (*Lessing*, complete works, ed. by *Lachmann*, Vol. VIII., p. 814 sq.) *Stäudlin*, Berengarius of Tours (Stäudlin and Tzschirner, Archives, Vol. III., p. 1); see *Reuter*, de Erroribus, etc. See above, p. 570. *Will*, Restoration of the Church, nro. 2. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. IV., p. 703 sq.

The view of the Eucharist set forth and defended in the eleventh century by Berengarius was an out-and-out *heresy*. Berengarius was born at Tours, was educated by *Fulbert* of Charters, and, after quitting school, taught secular branches for a time in his native city. A skillful dialectician, and possessing considerable knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church, he soon rose to eminence, and became, in the year 1031, Scholasticus, or Director of the Cathedral-school of Tours, and in 1041 was appointed Archdeacon at Angers.[1] On the fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, he adopted the teaching of *Scotus Erigena*, to whose authority he openly appealed,[1] and pursuing the rationalistic tendency[2] of his mind, which had early developed itself, he pronounced, still more distinctly and emphatically than his master, against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He held that no change whatever, in the strict and proper sense of the word,[3] was effected in the material elements of the Eucharist, and that the only change they underwent was precisely the same as that which takes place in the matter of the other Sacraments through the form of prayer used in each. Thus, for example, as a Divine virtue or influence is imparted to water or oil by the sacramental form, and operates through them, so also in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the bread and wine become the medium or channel of this virtue, but in themselves are essentially what they were before the sacramental act was performed. It is true, Berengarius admitted in words that a *change* takes place in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; that the *true* Body of Christ is present, and that there is an oblation of the Body of Christ in the Mass; but his only purpose in doing so was to give an orthodox coloring to his innovations, to give them a Catholic exterior, and to avoid openly assailing the received doctrine of the Church. Hence he clothed his errors in the accepted language of Catholic theology, and proposed openly what in his heart he denied. For, while using an orthodox phraseology, he really meant only *that Christ is spiritually present in the elements, and that a certain efficacy or virtue is imparted to them by the faith of the individual.*[1] That this was in truth the opinion of Beren

---

[1] On the life of Berengarius, Hist. littéraire de la France, T. VIII., p. 197 sq.

---

[1] Berengarius Joannis Scoti lectione ad hanc nefariam devolutus est sectam. (Flor. Franc. hist. fragm.) But Berengarius himself acknowledged that he was a partisan of Erigena: Si haereticum habes Joannem, cujus sententias de eucharistia probamus, habendus tibi est haereticus Ambrosius, Hieronymus, Augustinus, ut de caeteris taceam. (Ep. ad Lanfranc., in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. VI., p. 1016.) Cf. *Pagi* ad Baron. annal. a. 1050, nr. VII. Berengarius also made use of the same false method, in treating positive doctrines of the Church, that had been used by *Erigena*. For Lanfranc, de Eucharistia, c. 7, addressing him, says: Relictis sacris auctoritatibus ad dialecticam confugium facis. Et quidem de mysterio fidei auditurus ac responsurus, quae ad rem debeant pertinere, mallem audire ac respondere sacras auctoritates, quam dialecticas rationes. Therefore, exactly as magister Florus had complained of Scotus Erigena, see p. 429, n. 1.

[2] *Bp. Guitmund* thus refers to the studies of Berengarius: Cum juveniles adhuc in scholis ageret annos, *ut ajunt, qui eum tunc noverant*, elatus ingenii levitate, ipsius magistri sensum non adeo curabat, libros insuper artium contemnebat. And, further down, he goes on to say: Cum per se attingere philosophiae altioris secreta non posset, neque enim homo ita acutus erat, sed ut tunc temporis liberales artes intra Gallias pene obsoleverant, novis saltem verborum interpretationibus, quibus etiam nunc nimium gaudet, singularis scientiae sibi laudem arrogare et cujusdam excellentiae gloriam venari qualitercunque poterat affectabat.

[3] *Guitmund* says, l. c.: Nam Berengariani omnes quidem in hoc conveniunt, *quia panis et vinum essentialiter non mutantur.*

---

[1] Owing to the vacillating character of Berengarius and his frequent changes of mind, there is some doubt as to what was precisely his doctrine on the Eucharist. *Two* different opinions are ascribed to him: 1. That he denied Transsubstantiation, but admitted the Real Presence in the Eucharist; in other words, that he held a doctrine similar to that of *Lutheran* impanation. 2. That he denied the Real Presence, and, like *Zwinglius* at a later day, put a figurative interpretation upon the form of consecration. Relative to the first opinion, we have the words of *Martène* and *Durand* (Thesaur. nov. anecdotor., T. IV., p. 99): "Ex hoc loco et ex superius dictis patet, Berengarium realem, ut ajunt, Christi praesentiam admisisse in Eucharistia, sed transsubstantiationem praesertim eum negasse, id quod probat multisque exemplis demonstrat noster Mabillonius in praefat. ad saecul. VI. ord. Bened." And *Guitmund* relates: "Multum in hoc differunt (Berengariani), quod alii nihil omnino de corpore et sanguine Domini sacramentis istis inesse, sed tantummodo umbras haec et figuras esse dicunt. Alii vero dicunt, ibi corpus et sanguinem Domini revera, sed latenter contineri, et ut sumi possint, quodammodo, ut ita dixerim *impanari*. Et hanc ipsius Berengarii subtiliorem esse sententiam ajunt." But *Adelmann* (Director of the School of Liége, and in 1048 Bishop of Brescia), l. c. that the second opinion contains the true doctrine of Berengarius, who, he says, held only a *figura quaedam et similitudo*. But the following words of his own prove the true position of Berengarius: "Non minus *tropica locutione* dicitur: panis, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem est corpus Christi, et vinum sanguis, quam dicitur, Christus est leo, Christus est agnus, Christus est summus angularis lapis."

But the following words of Berengarius, taken from the third fragment of his epist. ad Adelmannum, are still more significant. He had already said in his treatise, *De sacra Coena*, that the whole Body of Christ was delivered up to death, *ita habeas totum integrumque Christi corpus accipi* (*per sacramentum altaris*), and that since the Body of Christ, being now in Heaven, in a condition of invisible unity, no visible manifestation of it can take place, and consequently, when the eating of His Body is spoken of, it should be understood in a *spiritual* sense to mean that the participant raises his mind and heart up to the Body of Christ in Heaven. He adds: Since, according to the words of Holy Writ, the Body and Blood will remain in Heaven until the end of the world, none of the faithful can presume to say, "se ad refectionem animae suae accipere nisi totam et integram Dei sui carmen, non autem coelo devocatam, *sed in coelo manentem*, quod ore corporis fieri ratio nulla permittit, cordis, ad garius is still further proved by his assertion that the Body of Christ, after His resurrection, could not possibly pass through the closed doors of the apartment in which the apostles were assembled; thus showing that he was either ignorant of or denied the properties of the spiritualized and glorified body.

The immediate occasion of the *breaking out* of this controversy was a correspondence between Berengarius and his former friend, *Lanfranc*, then Scholasticus of the cloister of *Bec*, in Normandy, and afterward Archbishop of Canterbury. Berengarius had hoped to find Lanfranc favorable to his own views; but, learning the contrary, he reproached him for having rejected the doctrine of Scotus Erigena as heretical, and for defending that of Paschasius Radbert, and closed his letter by inviting the monk of Bec to discuss the subject with him before a number of judges.

Lanfranc was then absent in Rome, and Leo IX., having received intelligence of the contents of the letter, called two synods (A. D. 1050)—the one at *Rome*, and the other at *Vercelli*—at both of which Lanfranc was present, to consider the teachings of Berengarius. After a careful examination, they were condemned, and the works of Scotus Erigena burnt. As Lanfranc had become suspected of favoring the views of Berengarius, he availed himself of the opportunity presented in these two synods to clear himself of the suspicion. He wrote, besides a refutation of the condemned errors, a history of the origin and purpose of this correspondence, and explained his other relations with Berengarius. He takes occasion in this work to give a clear and forcible exposition of the Church's teaching on the Sacrament of the altar; and, in reply to the objection of Berengarius, that some of the early Fathers of the Church frequently called the Eucharist *species*, *similitudo*, *figura*, says very appositely in the twentieth chapter, "that no one could even now *adequately describe the Sacrament*

---

videndum Deum mundati, devotione spatiosissima, nulla indignitate, nullis fieri prohibetur angustiis." It is impossible also, says he, and most unworthy of the Divine majesty, to receive Christ entire *ore corporis*, ac per hoc Christi corpus totum constat, accipi ab interiori homine, fidelium corde, non ore. Cf. *Bellarminus*, de sacra Eucharistia, lib. III., c. 18.

without employing these terms." He then goes on to show that the Doctors of the Church, while employing these terms, called the Eucharist "*the true Body and the true Blood of Christ*" (verum corpus et verus sanguis Christi). The controversy was spreading rapidly; the minds of men were much disturbed by it; and Berengarius himself, by his writings and addresses, was daily drawing to his side a greater number of followers. His teachings were again examined, and condemned, at a synod held at Paris, A. D. 1051. But the controversy grew only more and more heated and general as days went on. In the year 1055, *Hildebrand*, the Papal legate, who had come into France on other business, presided at the Council of Tours, convened for the settlement of this question, and, having granted Berengarius a fair hearing, expressed himself satisfied with a confession of faith which the latter was willing to make publicly before the assembled Fathers. The wording of this formula was in exact conformity with the doctrine of the Church, but Berengarius had no intention of making a profession of faith in the orthodox sense. Some of the Fathers suspicious of his honesty, and aware of his sophistical arts and his method of equivocating, where an equivocation would serve his purpose, insisted that his confession should be made more explicit, and that, while professing in words that bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the form of consecration, he should add that he received this doctrine *with internal assent.* He made the confession with this additional binding clause, solemnly and under oath, while he did not believe, as he afterward confessed, a single word he was saying, in the sense in which his auditors understood, and in which he knew they understood him. In this way he deceived the Papal legate, who had all along treated him with marked kindness, and whose whole thoughts were now occupied with the reformation of the abuses that had crept into the Church, rather than with the more subtle questions of theology.

When the artifice had been detected, Berengarius was cited before a *council* of one hundred and thirteen bishops, convoked *at Rome* (A. D. 1059) by Pope Nicholas II., and there obliged to commit his own writings to the flames, and to subscribe, under oath, to a confession of faith drawn up by Cardinal Humbert, in terms so *precise and emphatic* as to exclude any possibility of an equivocal interpretation. The expressions used in this document may seem *harsh*,[1] but it was necessary to employ them, this being the only possible way of preventing this wily sophist from appearing before the world as one having the sanction of the Church while engaged in assailing the very central dogma of her faith.

He had barely quitted Rome when he rejected the formula subscribed to before the council, as he said, from the fear of death. The duplicity of Berengarius, his submission and cowardice in the face of danger, and his arrogance and perjury when at a distance from it, are not attractive traits of character or proofs of exceptional manliness. Nor is our admiration for him much increased by the method he took to justify his conduct and compound with his conscience. He now appealed to the example of Aaron, who from fear had made a golden calf, and again to that of St. Peter, who from a like motive had denied his Master. Like a true precursor of more modern heretics, he assailed Pope Leo IX. in violent language, calling him, not *Pontifex*, but *Pompifex*, and called the Church of Rome, not the Apostolic See, but the See of Satan.

As he still continued to attack the doctrines of the Church, and to excite considerable disturbance throughout France by his teachings, Cardinal Hildebrand, who had in the meantime ascended the papal throne under the tile of *Gregory VII.*, summoned him once more to Rome. At a synod convened here (A. D. 1078), Berengarius was again required to declare, under oath, that "the bread of the altar is, after consecration, the true Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, died on the Cross, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in Heaven; and that the wine of the altar is, in like manner, after consecration, the true Blood which flowed from the side of Christ." And, in order to cut off any possible way to a subterfuge, he was required, at a synod held at Rome in the following year, to subscribe to a formula which, in speaking of the change of bread and wine in the Eucharist, contained, instead of the simple word "*converti*" or "*changed*," "*substantialiter converti*" or "*changed substantially*," with the antithesis "*non tantum per signum et virtutem Sacramenti sed in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae.*"

---

[1] "Panem et vinum, quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Chr. esse, et sensualiter non solum sacramento, sed etiam in veritate *manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri*, jurans per sanctam et homousion Trinitatem et per haec sacrosancta Christi evangelia." It was not intended to establish a profession of faith for the whole Church by this formula, but simply to compel this shifty dialectician to profess, without subterfuge, that the *substance* of the Body of Christ was truly eaten in the Eucharist, or to say he would not.

But this proud dialectician was obliged to submit to a still greater humiliation. Gregory ordered him to prostrate himself on the ground, and confess that *he had been all along in error* in his views on the mystery of the Eucharist. Fearing, as he says, that the Pope would pronounce sentence of excommunication upon him, and that the populace would in consequence hurry him off to the worst of deaths, he lost heart and yielded to the fresh demand. But, once he had quitted Rome, he was true to his old character, and drew up an account of the two Roman synods, in which he indulges in bitter taunts against such as opposed him, and wholly misrepresents the conduct of Pope Gregory, whom he accuses of wavering, inconstancy, and of hesitating as to which side he would take in the controversy.

Berengarius again endeavored to defend himself before a synod assembled at Bordeaux, A. D. 1080. His opponent was *Guitmund*, one of Lanfranc's disciples, who wrote a learned and able work[1] against him.

Bent under the weight of years, and broken with affliction, Berengarius withdrew, toward the close of his life, to the island of St. Cosmas, near Tours, where he spent his last days in retirement and comparative quiet. Chastened by the influence of a penitential and solitary life, he gradually gained the mastery over his pride, and became convinced of the truth of the Catholic doctrine in the Eucharist. He passed away in the year 1088, at peace with the Church, and manifesting in his last moment the most sincere sentiments of penitence, to the great edification of his many friends. His last words were: " To-day will my Lord Jesus Christ be made manifest to me, for my glory, as I humbly hope, in virtue of the penance I have done, or for my punishment, as the great number of souls whom I have led astray gives me cause to fear."

---

[1] Cf. *Gfrörer*, Univ. Ch. H., Vol. IV., Pt. I., p. 513. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 81.

CHAPTER VI.

MEMORABLE EVENTS IN THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 207. *Eastern Schism—Photius—Eighth Ecumenical Council.*

I. *Photii* ep. ed. *Montacutius*, Lond. 1651, f., in *Migne*, Ser. Gr., T. 102. *Nicetae Davidis* Vita s. certamen S. Ignatii (*Mansi*, T. XVI., p. 209), epp. Roman. Pontif. et Acta Synod. (*Mansi*, T. XV., XVI.; *Harduin*, T. V.)

II. *Leo Allatius* (about 1640), de Eccl. occident. et orient. perpetua consens., Col. 1648, 4to, and concerning his still unprinted works, cf. *Lämmer*, de Leonis Allat. codicibus, Friburgi, 1864. *Maimbourg, S.J.*, Hist. du schism des Grecs., Paris, 1677; German, by *Meuser*, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1841; second ed. contin. down to most recent times, 1853. *Pitzipios-Bey*, l'église orientale, exposé hist. de sa séparation et de sa réunion avec celle de Rome, Paris, 1855, 4 vols.; German, Vienna, 1857. **Katerkamp*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 359–448. †*Jager*, Hist. de Photius, ed. II., Paris, 1845; †*Tosti*, Storia dell' origine dello scisma Greco, Firenze, 1856, 2 vols. *Pichler*, Hist. of the ecclesiastical separation between the East and the West, Munich, 1861, Vol. I., censured by reason of excessive partiality. *Hergenröther*, Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, his life, his writings, and the Greek schism, Ratisbon, 1867, sq., 3 vols. *Palma*, Prael. H. E., T. II., Pt. II., p. 82–124. *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. IV., p. 218 sq.

Apart from the many points of ecclesiastical discipline which had been gradually sundering the Greek from the Roman Church in the interval between the Council of Sardica and the Iconoclast controversy, the cause of greatest offense to the Emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, and that which estranged them entirely from the interests of Rome, was the close alliance between the Papacy and the Empire of the West.

During the reign of *Michael III.*, surnamed the Drunkard, Bardas the Caesar, the uncle and tutor of the Emperor, made an attempt to gain possession of supreme power. But Bardas, though an ambitious and immoral man, had some commendable qualities, and was particularly distinguished as a munificent patron of literature and the sciences. Here praise must end. The most scandalous profanation of sacred things was permitted at the imperial court, and the most impious acts openly performed.[1]

Ignatius, the saintly patriarch, if unable to put a stop to these outrages upon decency and the sanctity of religion, was still in position to offer a determined resistance to the scandalous conduct of Bardas, to whom he denied permission to go to Holy Communion unless he would promise to live in lawful wedlock with his own wife and break off his incestuous intercourse with his daughter-in-law. He was equally determined in his opposition to an attempt to force Theodora and her daughters, the mother and sisters of the Emperor, to enter a convent and take the veil of religion. Such resistance to their will provoked the indignation and excited the anger of both the Emperor and Bardas, and, in order to avenge themselves for the supposed affront, they had the patriarch deposed, his adherents driven from places of influence and honor, and *Photius, a layman*, a relative and the first secretary of the Emperor, appointed to the patriarchal throne. Photius received ecclesiastical tonsure on the 20th of December, A. D. 857, and the other orders on the five succeeding days. As a matter of form, he was elected patriarch of Constantinople in the imperial palace, and was consecrated bishop on Christmas-day by *Gregory, Archbishop of Syracuse*, who had been previously excommunicated by the patriarch Methodius and deposed by Ignatius. A council held at Constantinople (A. D. 859) at first deposed Photius and declared him excommunicated, but the majority of the bishops being the servile tools of the court and sure of its protection, renewed the deposition of Ignatius and pronounced sentence of anathema upon him. He was next treated with every sort of ignominy, and finally driven to such extremes, by the violence of his persecutors, that he consented to put his name to an instrument of abdication.

As a strong party at Constantinople still held out in favor of Ignatius, the imperial court, in the hope of overcoming their opposition and closing the schism that divided the city, sent an embassy to Pope *Nicholas I.*, begging him to recognize Photius as the legitimate patriarch. Photius also sent a letter to the Pope, representing, in tones of feigned humility and simulated sorrow, how he had been forced, against his own will, to assume the burdensome duties of the patriarchate, and how the Emperor, who was so considerate and kind to others, had been so harsh and precipitate to him. Nicholas, though a simple-minded man, could not be imposed on by so thin a disguise. Very much to the surprise of both Photius and the Emperor, who, confident that he would not venture upon such a step, had cunningly requested him to send embassadors to Constantinople "to put an end to the quarrels occasioned by the new appointment to the patriarchate, and to remove the last traces of iconoclasm," Nicholas took them at their word, and in the year 860 sent thither, as his legates, *Rhodoald*, Bishop of Porto, and *Zacharias*, Bishop of Anagni. Unfortunately, these men were not faithful to their trust. On the one hand, they were taken in charge by the party of Photius, prevented from having access to others, and thus cut off from the only means of obtaining the information requisite to form a just judgment on the question at issue; and on the other, they permitted themselves to be bribed to take sides against Ignatius. After having been plied with all manner of promises and threats for above three months, they finally yielded, and at the so-called ecumenical council of Constantinople (A. D. 861), presided over by Photius and attended by three hundred and eighteen bishops, pronounced sentence of deposition on Ignatius and declared Photius the rightful patriarch. Ignatius at once drew up an appeal against this sentence, had it signed by the bishops and monks who adhered to him, and sent it to Rome by the abbot Theognist. Pope Nicholas, on a careful examination of the matter, found that his envoys had accepted bribes and violated his instructions, and accordingly declared them excommunicated in a Roman synod held A. D. 863, and, in the same assembly, deprived Photius of every sacerdotal office, honor, and prerogative, and recognized Ignatius as patriarch. When the Pope forwarded these decrees to Constantinople, the Emperor Michael sent back a very violent and abusive letter to which the Pope replied with dignity and courteous civility.[1]

---

[1] The courtiers were made to play the parts of priests and bishop in clerical attire. All the sacred rites of religion were, by order of the Emperor Michael, ridiculed and celebrated by buffoons as wicked as their master, with much pomp and at great expense. See Life of Ignatius, *Harduin*, V.. f. 974, and Constant. Porphyrogenet. Continuat. lib. IV., c. 38. (Tr.)

The exasperation which the Pope's course in this matter had excited at Constantinople was considerably heightened when *Bogoris*, *King of the Bulgarians*, whose subjects had been converted to Christianity by the Greeks, entered into union with the Church of Rome (A. D. 866) as the only means of putting an end to the confusion reigning among the Christian missionaries laboring in his kingdom. After Nicholas I. had published his celebrated *Responsa* (in one hundred and six chapters), for the instruction and guidance of those missionaries who went forth to carry the blessings of the Gospel and the light of civilization into distant lands, Photius issued a similar collection of instructions for the use of the Bulgarian neophytes; but, compared with that of the Pope, it was of little practical value.

In the year 866, Bardas, to whom Photius owed his elevation, was murdered by *Basil the Macedonian*, with the connivance and approbation of Michael. Basil was created Caesar, and took Photius under his protection. The latter now proceeded with increased violence against his opponents. He represented to the Emperor that, together with the seat of empire, the Primacy had also passed from Rome to Constantinople. He again revived all questions that had ever come up for discussion between the *two Churches*;[2] but, of all these, as Archbishop *Theophylactus* very justly remarked, the only one of vital importance was the controversy on the Filioque.

CONTROVERSY ON THE FILIOQUE.[3]

This controversy was of importance, chiefly because it involved a dogma of the Church, but partly also because the addition to the Symbol of Faith of the word *Filioque* (and from the Son) would naturally excite the hostility of the Greeks against the Latins.[1] The Greeks said that they would abide by the words of the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381), which ran, "*who proceeds from the Father* (i. e., from the Substance of the Father), who is adored and glorified with the Father and the Son, who spoke by the prophets." The West was now far in advance of the East in the province of speculative theology, and the relations of the Father to the Son and Holy Ghost were far more lucidly and accurately explained than formerly. This was chiefly due to the luminous and profound writings of SS. *Hilary*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and *Leo the Great*[2] on the subject.

---

[1] *Harduin*, V., 145. (TR.)

[2] *Photii* ep. 2, in *Montacutius*, p. 247.sq.; in *Migne's* Ser. Gr., T. 102, p. 722 sq.

[3] *Le Quien*, Dissert. de processione Spiritus St. (with his ed. opp. *Joh. Damasceni*, T. I.); *Walch*, Historia controvers. Graecor. et Latinor. de process. Spiritus St., Jen. 1757; *de Buc*, Essai de conciliation sur le dogme de la procession du St. Esprit, Paris, 1857; *van der Moeren*, Dissertatio theologica de processione Spirit. St. ex Patre Filioque, Lovan. 1864.

These theologians, in explaining the relations of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son, said that *He proceeds from the Father and from the Son.* Between the Latins and the more imaginative Greeks there was not any substantial difference[3] as to the doctrine itself. The difficulty between them arose from the preference on the part of the latter for the faulty formula "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *through the Son*" (*διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*).

---

[1] *Photii* Constantinop. liber de Spirit. Sti. mystagogia, quem notis variis illustratum ac theologiae crisi subjectum nunc *primum*, ed. *J. Hergenröther*, Ratisb. 1857; in *Migne's* Ser. Gr., T. 102. *Hergenröther*, The Theological Polemics of Photius against the Latin Church (*Tübg. Quarterly*, 1858, p. 559–592). By the *same*, Photius, Vol. I., p. 684–711.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 563. *Augustin.* de Trinit. IV. 20: Nec possumus dicere, quod Spir. St. et a *Filio non procedat*, neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video, quid aliud significare voluerit, cum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait: accipite Spiritum St. Neque enim flatus ille corporeus substantia Spiritus St. fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum St. Cf. V. 14; XV. 29, 47: Si quidquid habet, de Patre habet Filius: de Patre habet utique, ut et de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus.

[3] Ἡ *βασιλικὴ ἀγαθότης καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμὸς καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα ἐκ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διήκει.* Basil. de Sp. S., c. 18. *ἀξιώματι μὲν γὰρ δευτερεύειν τοῦ υἱοῦ, παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον καὶ ἀναγγέλλον ἡμῖν* . . . id. adv. Eunom. III. 1. — *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον.* Epiph. haer. 79, nr. 18, 52, and in many other places. — *ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον.* Greg. Nyss. de Sp. S. in *Mai*, Collect. VIII. II., p. 15. There are also Greek Fathers who call the Son the source of the Holy Ghost, *πηγὴ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, just as they call the Father the source of the Son, *πεγὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ.* Cf. *Petav.* Theolog. dogmat. de Trinit., lib. VII., c. 3–7, and *Hergenröther*, Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, according to St. Gregory of Naz., Ratisbon, 1850, and Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed., T. IV., p. 766. Very remarkable is the judgment on this controversy of *Holden*, Analysis Fidei: "Qui ex patre filioque procedit" haec formula explicatior et magis exquisita

The word *Filioque* first came into use in the West about the beginning of the fifth century. It was first familiarized in Spain, and is to be found in the symbol of faith of the first council of Toledo (A. D. 400), convened to condemn the Priscillianists. It was found incorporated into the symbol of Nice, as enlarged at Constantinople, when the Visigoths were converted to Christianity. Its use must have become pretty general before the holding of the third council of Toledo (A. D. 589), by a decree of which the people were ordered to sing the whole symbol containing it during the celebration of the Divine Mysteries. The formula based on the words of St. John xvi. 15, ran thus: "Who proceeds from the Father *and the Son*."[1]

The word passed from Spain into France and Germany in the course of the eighth century.

The Greeks, always more or less disposed to take exception to the proceedings of the Latin Church, professed to find an *error* against faith in this formula, notwithstanding the *unanimity* of the Western Church in receiving it. Nor can the answer of Pope *Leo III.* to the envoys sent by Charlemagne to consult him in relation to the proceedings of the synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (A. D. 809) be brought as an objection against this unanimity, for his words were directed against the extravagant interpretations put upon the formula by provincial synods, and not against the formula itself, which he fully admitted.[2]

---

videbatur Concilii Patribus, quam Graecorum loquendi modus—qui a patre *per filium* procedit—tametsi forsitan haec discrepantia in verbis magis quam in re ipsa sita sit, seposita malevola haereticorum intentione, qua Spiritus Scti. Deitatem impetere conati sunt, quod Patribus Concilii suspectum fortasse notum fuit.

[1] *Conc. Tolet.* I. a. 400; *Tolet.* III. a 589. Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificatorem, *ex Patre et Filio procedentem*, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et conglorificandum. (*Harduin*, T. III., p. 472; *Mansi*, T. IX., p. 981, and oftener.)

[2] The conference of Leo III. is given, with full details, in *Baron.* Annal. ad an. 809, nros. 53 sq. After having read attentively the proofs brought on the

Photius roused the suspicions of the Greeks by representing to them that the Latins were favoring the Manichaean heresy by admitting *two* principles in the Deity. It was this misrepresentation of facts that constituted the greatest obstacle to the success of the subsequent endeavors to unite the two Churches at the *Fourth (Ecumenical) Council of Lateran*, and at the councils of *Lyons* and *Florence*.[1]

As has been said, Photius managed to retain his influence at court after the accession to power of Basil, the murderer of his former patron, Bardas; and, confident of the sympathy of the Eastern bishops on the *Bulgarian* question, he determined to take vengeance on Rome for having declared for Ignatius and against himself. In the year 867, he convoked a synod at Constantinople, at which pretended representatives of the three patriarchs were present, and endeavored to invest it with the authority of an ecumenical council. The Pope was falsely accused of certain offenses, declared guilty, anathematized, and deposed.[2] It appears now that only twenty-one bishops put their names to this ludicrous decree, and consequently Photius must have forged the hundreds of others affixed to it, embracing bishops, priests, and deacons who had never so much as heard even of the existence of the synod. Photius, in order to flatter the vanity and gain the good-will of the Emperor Louis and his queen, Ingelberge, sent them, together with costly presents, an interpolated copy of the acts of this synod, in which they were addressed by the title of *Imperial*—an appellation which the Greeks had persistently refused to apply to the Western emperors.

The Pope could well afford to smile at these futile attempts to injure the Apostolic See, and, through it, the whole Church. They could deceive no one except such as wished to be deceived. But Photius now tried a bolder and more

---

procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, he said: "Ita sentio, ita teneo, ita cum his auctoribus et sacrae scripturae auctoritatibus. Si quis aliter de hac re sentire vel docere voluerit, defendo: et nisi conversus fuerit, et secundum hunc sensum tenere voluerit, contraria sentientem funditus abjicio."

[1] See §§ 221, 224, and 272.

[2] Ep. encycl. *Photii* l. c. and ad episcop. Aquilej. (*Combefisii* Auctuar. Bibl. PP. noviss., T. I., p. 527; *Migne's* Ser. Gr., T. 102, p. 722 sq.)

dangerous game. Knowing well that there is no better way of securing success among any people, and especially among people like the Orientals, who, proud of their traditions, did not wish to be dictated to by Rome, than by appealing to their prejudices, he accordingly adopted a plan by which he could do the most injury to Rome with the least expenditure of labor. In a circular letter[1] addressed to the three patriarchs and the more eminent bishops of the East, inviting them to take part in the synod of Constantinople, he took occasion to attack the Church of Rome. He represented her as teaching, through her missionaries in Bulgaria, new and erroneous doctrines. He said that these observed fast on Saturday, abridged the time of Lent by a week, took milk-food on fasting days, despised priests living virtuously in the married state, rejected confirmation administered by priests, falsified confessions of faith sanctioned by ecumenical councils by making additions to them, and, finally, taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds not from the Father only, but also from the Son, thus implying that there are two principles in the Trinity—the Father having the principle of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the Son also the principle of the Holy Ghost.[2]

The Pope invited many eminent bishops, and among them Hincmar of Rheims, to take up the defense of the Western Church and refute the false and damaging accusations brought against her by Photius.

The most important writings called forth by these invitations were the defenses of *Aeneas*, Bishop of Paris, and *Ratramnus*, a monk of Corbie. The latter is especially distinguished by the judicial calmness and Christian temper with which he treats the subject, and all found it an easy task to repel and confute the false charges brought against the Latin Church.

In the year 867—the same in which the Synod of Constantinople was held—the despicable emperor, Michael, met with the punishment which his crimes richly deserved. His favorite and co-regent, Basil *the Macedonian*, contrived his destruction, had himself proclaimed sole Emperor and crowned by Photius, whom, on the following day, he drove from the patriarchal throne. There were political reasons why Basil should do this. He felt the necessity of securing himself on the imperial throne by gaining the good-will of the people, who, for the most part, believed that Ignatius had been wronged, and longed to see him restored to his former dignity. Ignatius was accordingly reinstated, and, by his advice, the Emperor wrote to the Pope, advising him of what had taken place, and requesting him to convoke an ecumenical council to annul the decrees of the synod held under the presidency of Photius, and to put an end to his party—a request to which Nicholas cheerfully acceded. Nicholas died before this project could be carried into effect, but his successor, *Hadrian II.* (A. D. 867–872), took it up after him. He held a council at Rome (A. D. 868), at which Photius was again deposed and sentence of anathema passed upon him, Ignatius declared the rightful patriarch, and the acts of the false synod of Constantinople committed to the flames. The Pope then gave his consent to the convocation of an ecumenical council at Constantinople.

---

[1] Epist. II. (Tr.)

[2] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Cox's trans., Vol. III., pp. 90, 91. (Tr.)

EIGHTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 869).

The bishops of the East were summoned to attend this council by the Emperor. That it required *a special request, addressed by the Greek Emperor* to the Saracens, to obtain a permit for the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria to proceed to Constantinople, is a sad commentary on the position of the Greek Empire then, compared with what it had formerly been.

The council was opened in the Church of St. Sophia, October 5, A. D. 869. The papal legates presided, and below them sat Ignatius and the representatives of the other patriarchs. The first question treated of by the council was the affair between *Ignatius* and *Photius.* The latter was condemned as an usurper, an author of schism, and a falsificator of synodal decrees; his partisan, *Gregory of Syracuse*, and the other advocates of his cause, were cut off from the communion of the Church;[1] the acts of the false synods held by him were burned; and sentence of anathema passed upon the contumacious Iconoclasts.

After these affairs had been gone through, there was an interruption of three months, and when the council again convened, February 12, A. D. 870, the false testimony against Ignatius was examined, the decrees of the Pope against Photius and in favor of Ignatius confirmed, and the ordinations conferred by Photius declared unlawful. In conclusion, the Fathers drew up a capital decree (*ὅρος*) embracing the twenty-seven canons passed by the council, to which all affixed their signatures, but the papal legates added the condition that the decrees should be still subject to revision by the Pope.

This ended the main work of the council, to the satisfaction of both the Emperor and the papal legates, after which the legates, Ignatius, the representatives of the patriarchs, and the ambassadors of the Bulgarian king assembled in the imperial palace to discuss the supplementary question of jurisdiction over the *Bulgarians.* The embassadors perfidiously asked to what Church (i. e., patriarchal) the church of their nation should be subject? The Orientals replied that, "since Bulgaria had formerly formed part of the Greek Empire, and since the Bulgarians, on taking possession of the territory, found there Greek and not Latin priests, it seemed quite clear that the Church of Bulgaria should recognize the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople." The papal legates answered to this, that "the jurisdiction of the Church is not circumscribed by territorial limits; that the bishops of the two provinces of Epirus, and those of Thessaly and Dardania (Bulgaria), had been consecrated, either directly by the Roman Church or by her vicars, until these countries were withdrawn from her jurisdiction by the violence of Leo the Isaurian; that the King of Bulgaria and his people had voluntarily passed to the obedience of Rome, and recognized in its bishop the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles; and that it was still their desire to receive from the Roman Pontiff their doctrine, their bishops, and their priests." The legates finally appealed to the superior jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, which could not accept the decision of another. The discussion went on, and the Greeks continued obstinate. Ignatius, who was under so many obligations of gratitude to the Church of Rome, was appealed to, but in vain, to interpose his influence and end the quarrel. His answer was conveyed in general and evasive language, and he shortly after sent the learned *Theophylactus* as first metropolitan into Bulgaria. The dispute on either side grew daily more vehement and determined, and now threatened to end in a violent division of the two churches.

---

[1] It is important here to consult *Anastasius* the Librarian, who, as envoy of the emperor Louis II., was present at the tenth session, and assigns the reasons for the small number of subscriptions to the Council. *Hefele,* Hist. of Councils, Vol. V., pp. 369, 413.

In the meantime, Hadrian II. had died, and his successor, *John VIII.* (A. D. 872–882), at the request of the Emperor, sent the bishops of Ostia and Ancona as legates to Constantinople. They were the bearers of letters to Ignatius, commanding him to at once recall the Greek bishops and priests from Bulgaria, and, in case he should refuse to comply, threatening him with suspension, and, if he should still continue obstinate, with excommunication. Fortunately, a rupture was prevented by the death of Ignatius (A. D. 877 or 878).

Photius, though deprived of the patriarchal throne, had neglected nothing which could bring him into favor at court. He took every occasion to flatter the Emperor, and, among other ingenious devices for this purpose, drew a family tree, on which the genealogy of Basil was traced back to the remote Arsacidae. A service which threw the prestige and luster of antiquity and royalty about an obscure dynasty could not fail of bringing its author into positions of influence and prominence, and Photius had accordingly been made tutor to the young prince and counselor to the Emperor; and, three days after the death of Ignatius, was again raised to the patriarchal throne.[1]

At the prayer of the Emperor, the papal legates, and the Oriental bishops, Pope John VIII. consented to recognize the validity of Photius' claim to the patriarchate; provided, however, that he would apologize before a synod for the evil he had already done, and enter upon a better course of life; that the jurisdiction of Rome over the Bulgarians should be acknowledged; that no layman should henceforth be appointed bishop, and that those who had been ordained by Ignatius should be permitted to retain their positions.[1] But Photius had no intention of keeping these promises, and, once on the patriarchal throne, directly proceeded to carry out his schemes with increased violence and the most shameless dishonesty. In the first session of a great *council* held *at Constantinople* (A. D. 879), at which three hundred and eighty bishops were present, his friend, *Zachary* of Ephesus, made a speech, in which, after bestowing the most extravagant praise on Photius—giving him, among other titles, that of "the Divine"—he went on to say that "there was no special need of this council; that it had convened merely to save the *honor* of the *Roman* Church, and to remove from her the charge of having promoted discord and schism."[2] In the second and third sessions, Photius read the Pope's letter to himself and his instructions to the legates in a mutilated and interpolated translation, omitting whatever reflected upon his own conduct, and particularly the conditions required of him before taking possession of the patriarchal throne, and introducing a eulogy of himself and a repudiation of the Eighth Ecumenical Council. In the fourth session, the Pope's instructions with regard to the jurisdiction of Bulgaria and the appointment of a layman to the office of bishop were entirely disregarded, and a proposal to condemn the synods that had declared against Photius met with general acceptance. In the sixth session, the symbol of Nice, with the Constantinopolitan addition of 381, was read, accepted, and sentence of anathema pronounced against those who should add to it or take from it. This last clause was evidently directed against the addition of the Filioque.

---

[1] The facts of the Bulgarian difficulty have been taken chiefly from *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Eng. trans., Vol. III., p. 97 sq. (Tr.)

---

[1] Joh. VII. ep. 199 and 253 (*Mansi*, T. XVI., p. 136 sq.; in *Harduin*, ep. 93, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 63 sq.), in *Baron.* ad a 879. *Hefele*, l. c., p. 434 sq.

[2] *Harduin*, VI., p. 223. (Tr.)

In the seventh and last session, Procopius of Caesarea made an address, containing an extravagant eulogy of both the Emperor and Photius, the latter of whom he compared to Christ because of his efforts to unite all the fathers of the Church in one sheepfold and under one shepherd, and bestowed upon him the title of ecumenical patriarch. The council then closed with the profession, that the acts were the belief and the teaching of all, and that whosoever did not so think and believe would not see the glory of God. The Papal legates being ignorant of the Greek language, and completely outwitted by the diplomatic astuteness and dishonesty of the Greeks, acted in good faith, and gave their assent to nearly every enactment of the council.

When the letter of Photius accompanying the acts of the council reached the Pope, the latter replied, expressing his astonishment that many things had been done contrary to his instructions, which, in some instances, had been entirely altered.[1] He closes this letter, which was conveyed to Constantinople by Bishop Marinus, with the declaration, that "he would not consider binding upon him, whatever his legates had done contrary to his instructions."[2] When Marinus had arrived at Constantinople, and proceeded to carry out his instructions from the Pope, the Emperor ordered him to be cast into prison, where he remained for a month. When the knowledge of this outrage came to Rome, Pope John, placing his hands upon the Book of Gospels, solemnly excommunicated Photius and all who advocated his cause, or recognized the late council, held under his presidency. This sentence was repeated by the successors of John VIII., Marinus I. and Hadrian III. But it was not till *Leo VI.*, the Philosopher, the son of Basil, came to the throne (A. D. 886), that Photius was obliged to relinquish the patriarchate. He withdrew to a monastery, where he died, A. D. 891. The new Emperor appointed his youngest brother, *Stephen*, to the patriarchate.

---

[1] Mirandum valde est, cur multa, quae nos statueramus, aut aliter habita, aut mutata esse noscantur, et nescimus, cujus studiis, vel neglectu variata monstrentur. Epist. 108, *Harduin*, VI., p. 87. (Tr.)

[2] Si fortasse nostri legati in eadem synodo contra apostolicam praeceptionem egerint, nos nec recipimus nec judicamus alicujus existere firmitatis, l. c. (Tr.)

and, together with the bishops then at Constantinople, wrote to the *Pope*, requesting him to *confirm* the appointment. But while Pope Stephen (V.) VI. was still taking counsel, uncertain, amid the conflicting reports that reached him, how to proceed, the young patriarch died (A. D. 893). He was succeeded by *Anthony II.* (A. D. 899), in whose behalf a number of bishops, headed by Stylianus of Caesarea, addressed a letter to *Formosus*, the then reigning Pope. The Pontiff replied, granting their prayer, but refusing at the same time to recognize the legality of the ordinations conferred by Photius; for, it was argued, "Photius could not confer a dignity (the priesthood) which he did not himself (lawfully) possess." Compared with the treatment of the Meletians, Novatians, and Donatists, in a former age, this decision was certainly harsh.

§ 208. *Revival of the Schism by Michael Cerularius.*

Epp. Nicolai Patriarch. (*Baron.* ad a. 912.) *Luitprandi* Legatio ad Nicephor. Phoc. (Corpus Scriptor. Hist. Byzant., Bonn., 1828, Pt. XI.) Epp. *Cerularii* et alior. (*Canis.-Basnage*, Lectt. Antiq., T. III., Pt. I., p. 281 sq.) Epp. Leonis IX. (in *Mansi*, T. XIX.; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 927 sq.) Most complete collection of them in Acta et Scripta, quae de controversiis eccles. Gr. et Latin. saec. XI. composita extant, etc., ed. *Corn. Will*, Lips. et Marb. 1861, in 4to.

The successors of the patriarch Anthony remained, during the tenth century, in communion with Rome, and the other patriarchs of the East continued to enter the names of the Roman bishop upon their diptycha, and to commemorate them in the canon of the Mass. But for all this, the intercourse between the two Churches was neither active nor cordial. When the *Emperor Leo*, in spite of the protests of the patriarch, *Nicholas the Mystic* (A. D. 896, with an interruption till 925), and contrary to the usage of the Greek Church, contracted a fourth marriage (A. D. 905), he was excommunicated. This display of firmness on the part of the Patriarch was the occasion of a transient rupture in the Byzantine Church. Nicholas refused to yield, even to the Papal legates, who had come to Constantinople at the request of the Emperor, and advised a milder policy, and was in consequence violently deposed and cast into prison (A. D. 906). When on his death-bed, the Emperor repented of his course, asked pardon of Nicholas, and restored him to his former dignity. At a synod, held A. D. 920, fourth marriages were forbidden, and harmony was again restored between the two Churches.

But the jealousy arising from the ambition and mutual recriminations of princes, again caused their separation.

The occasion of this schism was the arrival of Papal legates at Constantinople, during a visit (A. D. 968) of Luitprand, Bishop of Cremona, as embassador of the Emperor Otho, bearing letters from Pope John XIII., in which *Phocas* was styled "Emperor of the Greeks" and Otho "*Emperor of the Romans and Augustus.*" The Greeks were so indignant at this assumption, as they regarded it, that throughout the course of the eleventh century, though sorely in need of assistance from the West, they repelled every honest attempt at reconciliation. Finally, the elevation of *Michael Cerularius* (A. D. 1043–1059) to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople became the immediate occasion of the separation of the two Churches, for which so many circumstances had already cleared the way. In the year 1053, he and *Leo of Achrida*, the learned metropolitan of Bulgaria, composed a circular letter, addressed to *John, Bishop of Trani*, in Apulia,[1] in which they revived all the old objections against the Church of Rome, dwelling particularly upon the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, fasting on Saturdays, the drinking of blood and the eating of things strangled, and the omission of the Alleluja during the Lenten fast. This letter came in the way of Cardinal-bishop *Humbert*, who translated it, and forwarded a copy to Pope *Leo IX.* About the same time news arrived at Rome that the patriarch Cerularius had deprived the abbots and monks of their churches and monasteries for refusing to give up their own and adopt the usages of the Greek Church. The Pope felt that, under the circumstances, there was a call upon him to reply to the circular letter of the Greek patriarch, which he did, in a letter addressed to both Cerularius and the metropolitan, Leo of Achrida, written with such clearness and moderation that it produced a favorable impression upon the Emperor, who, on the one hand, requested Leo IX. to send legates to Constantinople, and, on the other, compelled the patriarch to renew friendly relations with the See of Rome. The Pope complied with this request, and in the year 1054 sent as his legates Cardinal Humbert, Peter (Archbishop of Amalfi), and the Chancellor Frederic, who were the bearers of a letter to the emperor *Constantine IX.* (Monomachus), written with considerably more severity than the former one addressed to the patriarch, and containing *animadversions* on the pride of the latter *for presuming to arrogate* to himself the title of "*Ecumenical patriarch.*"[1] Constantine received the legates kindly, entertained them in his own palace, and sought to mollify the wrath of the patriarch. But the latter, who had all along studiously avoided a meeting with the legates, complained that the Romans came to Constantinople not *to be taught*, but *to teach*,[2] and accused the Emperor of being in collusion with them. The legates, after an angry *correspondence*,[3] finding that it was impossible to come to terms with Cerularius, solemnly excommunicated him (July 16, A. D. 1054), and placed upon the altar of the Church of St. Sophia, in presence of clergy and people, the *instrument* of excommunication.[4] They then returned to Rome, under a safe-conduct from the Emperor.

---

[1] *Baron.* ad a. 1053, nr. 22. *Leo Allat.*, lib. III., c. 14, in *Will*, Acta et Scripta, p. 51–64.

But, on the other hand, Cerularius was not an idle spectator of events. He represented to the people that the Emperor was in league with the Latins to destroy the Greek Church, and left no means untried to excite public feeling against him. He also assembled a synod at Constantinople[5] (A. D. 1054), by an edict of which the Pope's name was erased from the liturgy. This spiteful ebullition, while both harmless and ludicrous, shows to what lengths even men of parts may be driven by motives of pride and ambition. In a letter written to *Peter, Patriarch of Antioch,* Cerularius gave an increased catalogue of the scandals which he fancied he had discovered in the Roman Church. Among other things, he objects that bishops wore rings and engaged in war; that two brothers were permitted to marry two sisters; that baptism was administered by a single immersion, and that the images and relics of saints were not honored.

---

[1] *Baron.* ad an. 1054, nro. 10 sq. Both epistles in *Will*, p. 56–92.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 675.

[3] *Humberti* Cardinalis dialogus, quo textus praefatorum sycophantarum explicatur; *Nicetae* Presbyteri et monasterii Studii libellus contra Latinos editus; *Humberti* Responsio adv. Nicet. libellum, in *Will*, l. c., p. 93–150.

[4] *Baron.* ad an. 1054, nr. 19–43. The brevis et succincta commemoratio eorum, quae gesserunt Apocrisiarii — in regia urbe, in *Will*, p. 150–154.

[5] In *Will*, l. c., p. 155–168.

The efforts of *Peter of Antioch* and *Theophylactus,*[1] Archbishop of Achrida, to prevent a formal schism, were to no purpose. The haughty patriarch, Michael Cerularius, would listen to no terms of accommodation. His arrogance became so excessive, that he openly declared "there was but a very trifling difference between the priestly and imperial dignity," and assumed the insignia and emblems of royalty. So great was his influence, that, in the year 1057, he caused the deposition of the emperor, Michael Strationicus, and elevated *Isaac Comnenus* to the throne. But the latter, in the very year of his elevation, offended at the insolence of the patriarch, exiled him to the island of *Proconnesus,* in the Sea of Marmora, where he died, A. D. 1059.

His death did not, however, change the relations of the two Churches. They regarded each other with suspicion and mutual distrust, and the schism, though not yet formal, was irreparable. No sooner had the Oriental Church been left to herself, cut off from Rome, and deprived of the strong and unyielding authority of the Papacy, than she became the slave of the State and the pliant tool of imperial power.

---

[1] *Cerularii* ep. II. ad Petr. Antioch. (*Cotelerii* Eccl. Gr. Monumenta, T. II. *Will,* p. 172–204.) Among the reproaches made to the Latin Church are the following, viz: That the priests did not permit their beards to grow; that the bishops wore rings, as if their churches were their brides; that two brothers might espouse two sisters; that the Latins did not honor relics, nor many among them images of the saints; and, finally, that they had falsified the Symbols of Faith by the addition *filioque.* Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, wrote in defense of the Latin Church, in *Coteler,* l. c., p. 158; in *Will,* p. 189–204, and *Theophylactus,* in his treatise, "Περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλοῦνται Λατῖνοι" (*Mingarelli,* Fasciculus Anecdotor., Romae, 1756), calls this reproach a *σατανικὴ συκοφαντία.* Conf. *Neander,* Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 645–649, English transl., by Torrey; 11th American ed., Boston, 1872, Vol. III., p. 584 sq., where it is also said: "Perhaps what had been heard concerning the principles of the older Frankish church furnished the occasion for the accusation of the neglect of relics and images of the Saints." (Tr.)

§ 209. *Learning among the Greeks.*

Some of the emperors who occupied the throne of Byzantium during this epoch were themselves scholars and authors of merit. Such were Basil the Macedonian, Leo the Philosopher, and Constantine VII.; and others, again, were patrons of institutions of learning and of scientific and literary men. The period which passes under the name of "*Byzantine*" produced many indifferent and not a few excellent authors in almost every province of literature. Of the theologians, the patriarch *Photius* († A. D. 891) is the most distinguished. Besides being a first-rate scholar himself, he was also a munificent patron of institutions of learning. In his "*Bibliotheque*"[1] have come down to us extracts from two hundred and seventy-nine works, both Christian and Pagan, all of which have perished in the lapse of ages; and his "*Nomocanon*,"[2] as a collection of laws, is superior in method and convenient arrangement to any preceding work of a similar character.

The best known of the exegetical writers are *Arethas*, Bishop of Caesarea (c. A. D. 950); *Oecumenius*, Bishop of Tricca,[3] in Thessaly[4] (c. A. D. 990; *Theophylactus*,[5] Archbishop of Bulgaria († A. D. 1107); and *Euthymius Zigabenus*,[6] a monk of Constantinople († A. D. 1118). The prevailing tendency among the Byzantines, in treating any branch of theology, whether history, exegesis, or dogma, was to bring together and arrange, according to a fixed plan, a number of extracts from the most eminent writers of preceding ages, without any attempt to put them through a mental process, assimilate them, make them their own, and bring them forth fresh, in a new form, from the mold of their own minds. This method is specially characteristic of the later expounders of Holy Writ, whose interpretations are borrowed chiefly from St. John Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others nearly, if not quite, the equals of these in intellectual endowments. A great deal of the merit and utility of such collections, or, as they were sometimes called, "*golden chains*," depended upon the pertinency of the selections to illustrate the subject in hand, and on their skillful arrangement. Hence there was a wide field left to the critical talent and judgment of the compilers, some of whom, and notably Oecumenius, Theophylactus, and Euthymus Zigabenus, are reckoned among the best of the older exegetical writers.

---

[1] *Μυριόβιβλον* s. Bibliotheca, ed. *Hoeschelius*, Rothomagi, 1653, f. *Imm. Bekker.*, Berol. 1824, 2 T., 4to, in *Migne*, Ser. Gr., T. 103, 104.

[2] Pars I. c. schol. Zonarae et Balsalm. (*Bevergii* Synodicon s. pandectae canonum., Oxon. 1672, 2 T., f.; Pars II. *Justelli.* Bibl., T. II., p. 785, in *Migne*, Ser. Gr., T. 104. *Pitra*, Jus Graec., T. II.)

[3] Comment. in act. Apost.; epp. Paulin. et cath., ed. *Morellus*, Par. 1631, 2 T., f., in *Migne*, Ser. Gr. *posterior*, T. 118, 119.

[4] Not Thrace, as *Neander* says. (Tr.)

[5] Comment. in XII. prophet. minor.; IV. evang.; acta Apost.; epp. Paulin (opp. ed. *Finetti de Rubeis*, Ven. 1755, 4 T., f.), in *Migne*, Ser. Gr., T. 123–126.

[6] Comment. in Psalm. (opp. Theophyl.); in IV. evang., ed. *Matthaei*, Lps. 1792, 3 T., in *Migne*, Ser. Gr., T. 128–131.

Simeon, surnamed "*Metaphrastes*," on account of the skill which he displayed in working up and embellishing several old lives of saints and martyrs, gained quite a reputation, probably during the latter half of the tenth century, by the remarkable biographies which he published of one hundred and twenty-two saints.[1]

Some time in the course of the tenth or eleventh century, one *Suidas*, the circumstances of whose life are unknown, published a sort of cyclopaedia, called a *Lexicon*, containing definitions and explanations of words, notices of persons, histories of places, etc., arranged in alphabetical order. This work is of great value to the student of antiquity, inasmuch as it has preserved to posterity numerous extracts from ancient Greek writers, both profane and ecclesiastic, from grammarians, scholiasts, and lexicographers; in short, a whole store of linguistic and literary information,[1] taken from a host of authors, most of whose works have long since perished.

---

[1] These lives are scattered here and there in the pages of *Surius* and *Bollandus*, Vitae (acta) Sanctorum; a list of eighty-eight, in *Hamberger*, Authentic Traditions, Vol. IV., p. 140–142. Cf. *Leo Allatius*, de variis Simeonibus et Simeonum scriptis, in *Combefis* manipul. Constantinop., Paris, 1664, 4to.

§ 210. *Conversion of the Chazari, Bulgarians, and Russians, by the Greeks.*

The Tartars, or, more properly, *Tatars*,[2] who, issuing from the country along the southwestern shores of the Caspian Sea and directing their course across the Caucasus, went north beyond the river Volga, and thence went on till they reached the Danube, were of the same family as the Turks—i. e., Mongolian—and first became known to Europe under the names of *Avari*, Chazari, and Bulgarians. About the close of the sixth century, the Western *Avari*, under their great leader, Khan Bajan, conquered Pannonia and the adjacent countries as far as Friuli and the rivers Enns and Elbe. In the course of the seventh and eighth centuries, their rule extended from the banks of the Dnieper over the countries of Ukraine, Moldavia, Wallachia, Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia, as far as Norgaw.[3] Those of them living further to the west were conquered by Charlemagne, and thereby converted to Christianity. They were well-nigh extirpated by the Moravians, and, after the year 827, ceased to occupy a place in history.

The religion of the *Chazari*, who never came farther west than Southern Russia, was for a long time a mixture of Paganism, Islamism, Judaism, and Christianity. After the year 950, the Gospel was preached to them by *Cyril*.

Of the *Bulgarians*, some settled along the banks of the Volga, and, in the ninth and tenth centuries, embraced Islamism; others settled in Moesia, and, uniting with the Slaves, founded European Bulgaria. Their frequent conflicts with the Byzantine Empire gave them an opportunity of gaining a knowledge of Christianity, which they were disposed to look upon with favor after having had their prayers answered by the God of the Christians, whom they called upon in a season of famine.

---

[1] Ed. *Küsterus*, Cantabr. 1703, 3 T., f.; ed. *Gaisford*, Oxon. 1834, 3 T., f.; ed. *Bernhardy*, Hal. 1834, 3 T., 4to. Cf. *Chambers*' Cyclop. (Tr.)

[2] Thus, for example, the Syrian historians have Tataroi. (Tr.)

[3] *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 31. (Tr.)

At the request of their prince, *Bogoris*, the Emperor Michael sent the monk *Methodius*[1] (A. D. 863) to preach the Gospel among them. The prince, being very fond of pictures, commissioned the missionary, who was quite an artist, to paint a chase on the walls of one of his palaces. But, instead of complying with this request, Methodius *represented the Last Judgment*—a subject which gave him an opportunity of explaining the truths of Christianity. These he impressed upon the minds and brought home to the hearts of his hearers with such eloquence and depth of feeling that the prince and the great bulk of his people were converted to the faith of Christ.

After his conversion, Bogoris requested Pope *Nicholas I.* to send him Roman priests; but, strange to say, when Archbishop Sylvester, who had been sent by *Hadrian II.*, the successor to Nicholas, arrived, the prince refused to receive him, and, in spite of the Pope's protests, had another consecrated by the patriarch *Ignatius* (between A. D. 867 and 874),[2] thus furnishing *a fresh subject of controversy between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople.*

The Waragian (Norman) *Ruric* (A. D. 864–879) was the first to unite the *Russians*[3] (or Ruriscians, so called from their leader) into a regularly organized kingdom. They soon acquired the habits of plunder, and shared the enterprising spirit of Ruric and his companions in arms. When engaged in predatory expeditions, or in search of new fields of conquest, they frequently made their appearance off Constantinople. Their wars with the Greeks brought them, for a *second time*, to a knowledge of Christianity, which, according to an ancient tradition, had been preached on the banks of the Don, in the Cheronesus, and in the environs of Kiew, by the apostle *St. Andrew.* Be this as it may, it is quite certain that Christianity was known among the inhabitants of Southern Russia at a very early day, for *Tertullian*, *Origen*, and, still later, St. John *Chrysostom*, and many others, in speaking of the wonderful triumphs of the Cross, state that the word of the Gospel had, even in their time, been preached among the Scythians and Sarmatians, of whom, if we may trust the geography of Tacitus and Strabo, the Russians and Roxolans formed a part. But whatever knowledge of Christianity they may have then possessed was entirely lost amid the universal upheaval and chaos caused by the migrations, and the Gospel truths made no satisfactory or permanent impression upon them till the ninth century, when the patriarch *Ignatius*, while still at peace with the Holy See, sent missionaries into their country. The whole empire was converted during the tenth century, and just in that space of time which intervened between the patriarchates of *Photius* and *Cerularius*, and when the Churches of Rome and Constantinople were at least still united, if not in complete harmony. The work was commenced under *Oleg* (until A. D. 912), and progressed favorably under his successor, *Igor* (A. D. 912–945), who was undoubtedly led to respect the Christians and appreciate their religion by the gentle influence of his good and prudent queen, *Olga.* On the death of Igor (A. D. 945), this princess took the reigns of government into her own hands and ruled the empire till her son, *Swätoslav*, came of age (A. D. 855). Having, while at the head of the government, had occasion to visit Constantinople, she received baptism from the patriarch Theophylactus, taking *Helena* as her Christian name. "*This messenger of the Gospel*," says *Nestor*, the annalist, on her return to Kiew, "*like the morning-star going before the sun*," announced the coming of the full light of Christianity. About the year 956, she had a church built at Kiew and dedicated to St. Nicholas; and, about the year

---

[1] *Constantin. Porphyrogen.* Continuator. IV. 13 sq. (*Barduni* Imper. Orient. I. 134.) *Photii* epp. in *Canisii* Lectt. Antiq., T. II., Pt. II., p. 379 sq. The letters of Popes Nicholas I., Hadrian II., and John VIII., in *Mansi*, T. XV. and XVI.; *Harduin*, T. V. and VI., pt. I. Cf. *Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXVIII., p. 346–375.

[2] *Nicetas David.*, Ignat. vita (*Mansi*, T. XVI., p. 245). Cf. *Fallmerayer*, Hist. of the peninsula of Morea during the Middle Ages, Stuttgart, 1830, Vol. I.

[3] *Strahl*, Hist. of the Russian Church, Halle, 1830, T. I. †*Stolberg-Kerz*, Pt. XXXII., p. 29–73. **Theiner*, Recent Situation of the Catholic Church of both rites in Poland and Russia, Augsb. 1844., p. 1–33. *Karamsin*, Hist. of the Russian Empire, in Germ., by *Hauenschild*, Riga, 1820, Vol. I. and II. *Ustrialow*, Hist. of Russia, 4 vols., transl. into Germ. by E. W., Stuttg. 1839.

961, asked and obtained Christian missionaries[1] from the Emperor Otho I. She closed her virtuous and holy life A. D. 969, without, however, having had the consolation of seeing her son, the then reigning monarch, and his people converted to Christianity. The conversion of the Russians was reserved to her grandson, *Wladimir I.* (A. D. 980–1014.) The extensive conquests of this prince had gained him the title of *Great*, and his name became famous among many nations, some of which professed Mohammedanism, some Judaism, and some Christianity, and each was desirous of having him embrace its own peculiar form of worship. But, after examining them all, he concluded to become a Christian, was baptized at the city of Cherson (A. D. 988), taking as a Christian the name of Wassily, and, by his labors in behalf of his new religion, earned for himself the glorious title of *the Apostolical.* After his marriage to the Greek princess Anna, he set about converting his people to Christianity. He commanded all the idols at Kiew to be destroyed, and the statue of Perun, the chief god of the Russians, to be overturned and cast into the Dnieper. He next ordered the inhabitants, young and old and of both sexes, to appear, on the following day, on the banks of the same river, to receive baptism. Those who had the previous day lamented the destruction and loss of their idols, like true Slaves, came now in a body and submitted to be baptized as freely as if they had never bowed before sticks and stones, and like persons glad to be rid of them. According to the narrative of *Nestor*, at the conclusion of the ceremony, "*Wladimir,* kneeling upon the bank of the river, returned thanks to God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and besought Him to bless these His new children, and to confirm them in the faith."

The work commenced and put under way by Wladimir was completed by *Jaroslaw*, his son and successor (A. D. 1019–1054). This church was under the spiritual government of the *metropolitan* of *Kiew*. This city, having within its limits not less than four hundred churches, and called, on account of its importance, the second Constantinople, remained in close union with both the Eastern and Western Churches until the time of Cerularius.

---

[1] †**Aschbach,* The Mission sent by Emperor Otho I. to the Grand Duchess Olga. (*Dieringer's* Cath. Review, 1844, Vol. I., p. 82–94.)

Michael I. (A. D. 988–992), *Leontias* (A D. 992–1008), *Jonas* (A. D. 1008–1035), *Theopemptus* (A. D. 1035–1051), and *Hilarion* (A. D. 1051–1072), succeeded each other as metropolitans of Kiew. The last-named was appointed without the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and in obedience to an order of the Grand Prince, Jaroslaw, at a synod held at Kiew. Those who succeeded him remained always united to the Church of Rome in spite of the intrigues of Cerularius. As a proof of this opinion, we may mention the institution of a feast to commemorate the translation (May 9, A. D. 1087) of the relics of St. Nicholas of Myra, in Lycia, to Bari, in Lower Italy, which was made obligatory upon the whole Russian Church, in 1093, by the patriarch *Ephraïm* (A. D. 1090–1096). Even the liturgical books in use in the Russian Church at the present day were all composed during the period when she still preserved friendly relations with the Church of Rome. These relations, notwithstanding the hierarchical subordination of the Russian Church to that of Constantinople, were not seriously shaken until the fifteenth century, when they were entirely broken off.

From the eleventh century onward, the *Monastery of the Catacombs or of Peczera*, at Kiew, became for Russia the seat of learning, the home of literature, the seminary of the clergy, and the center of civilization. It was in this monastery that *Nestor* (A. D. 1056–1111) wrote his annals in the language of his country,[1] and this one fact would seem to indicate, that if the Russian Church had remained united to Rome, the country would have seen an incomparably greater intellectual progress, and a more abundant development of its material resources and elements of national prosperity, than its history shows.

---

[1] Annales until 1110, Petersburg, 1767, sq., 5 T., 4to, transl., with annotations, by *Schloezer*, Götting. 1802, sq., 5 vols.

§ 211. *Sects of the Eastern and Western Churches.*

The errors of Gnosticism and Manichaeism were propagated in the countries lying beside those inhabited by Chazari and Bulgarians, and in the Crimea, by the old sect of the Paulicians.[1] These sectaries passed, in the eleventh century, into countries lying farther west, particularly into *Upper Italy* and *France*, where they were known as *Manichaeans*; from whom, however, they were distinguished by a practical mysticism, an extravagant asceticism, and a determined opposition to every form of ecclesiastical hierarchy. It is more than likely that *Leuthard*[2] was of this class of Paulicians. He was an ignorant and illiterate man, and first made his appearance among the peasantry about Châlons-sur-Marne, preached against the use of images, destroyed all crucifixes that came in his way, and ended by destroying himself.

We have fuller and more accurate knowledge of another *sect* which flourished, about the year 1022, in the country around *Orleans*,[3] and professed to believe nothing except *what the Holy Ghost had written upon the heart of each individual. Lisoi* and *Stephen*, the leaders of this heretical sect, together with a young ecclesiastic and disciple by the name of *Heribert*, were put to death by *order of King Robert.*

But the most peculiar of all these sects was that discovered by *Gerard*, Bishop of Cambrai, existing in the neighborhood of *Arras* (A. D. 1025), and founded by an Italian named *Gondolfo.*[4] He held that those alone possessed the true doctrine who renounced all earthly goods, subdued the passions, lived of the labor of their own hands, and embraced all men as brothers; but, in addition to all this, he held that *the Sacra-*

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 761 sq.

[2] *Glaber Radulph.*, lib. II., c. 2. Leuthardus in pago Catalaunico, in the year 1000.

[3] The accounts of the contemporaries, *Ademari* Chron. (*Bouquet*, T. X., p. 154 sq.) *Glab. Radulph.*, lib. III., c. 8 (ibid., p. 35); Gesta synodalia Aurelian. a. 1017 (*Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 376; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 821 sq., and *d'Achéry*, Spicilegium, T. I., p. 604.)

[4] The source of this is Acta *Synod. Atrebatens.* a. 1025 (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 607 sq.; *Mansi*, T. XIX., p. 423 sq.)

ments of *Baptism*, *Penance*, and the *Eucharist were unavailing*, and empty ceremonies, and, in proof of the assertion, appealed to the vices of the clergy. It was also a doctrine of this sect, that the efficient principle of justification in man is wholly *personal.*

Sectaries professing either the same or kindred doctrines, and known under the name of *Patarini*,[1] appeared openly, later on, at the town of *Monteforte*, near Turin, and others, withdrawing from public gaze, practiced their peculiar rites in the environs of Milan. One of these latter, named *Girard*, disclosed the teachings of the sect to Heribert, Archbishop of Milan (A. D. 1027–1046). The expression, Son of God, they said, has an allegorical meaning, and signifies the soul after it has been enlightened by the Lord; so also the Holy Ghost signifies the spiritual illumination of the mind, which enables it to penetrate the meaning of Holy Writ. Again, the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary and his birth are but figures of speech, to signify the birth of divine life in the soul, and the illumination of the intellect to the understanding of the Sacred Scriptures. We have a priest, said they, still speaking in an allegorical sense, who daily visits his brethren dispersed over the earth; when this one, who is sent of God, comes to us, we obtain from him, in virtue of our piety, the remission of our sins. We have no priest besides him. He wears no tonsure, and is not a Roman. We know no more of such things than of the Sacraments, of which we allow only those of faith and prayer.

It was also thought that the existence of a sect of Manichaeans had been discovered at *Goslar*,[2] about the year 1050, who held that the eating of any sort of animal food left the taint of impurity. In order to put a stop to the further propagation of their teachings, *Henry III.* had them all executed.[3] This manner of punishment, which, in the case of the Priscillianists, had already excited just and unanimous reprobation,[1] was assumed as a sort of *political right*, and constantly practiced by all rulers during the *Middle Ages*, when heresy was regarded in the light of a *civil offense*, and punishable by the State. That the Church had no hand in the infliction of the death-penalty in such cases, is clear enough, from the very different policy adopted by her in dealing with Gottschalk and Berengarius. *Vazon*, Bishop of Liége († 1048), protested, but in vain, against this policy of the State.[2]

---

[1] Source: *Landulf. Senior.* Mediolan. Histor., lib. II., c. 27 (*Muratori*, Scriptor., T. IV., p. 88). Uncertain statements in *Glaber Radulf.* IV. 2.

[2] *Hermanni Contracti* Chron. ad an. 1052 (*Pertz*, Monum. Germ., T. V.)

[3] This correlation with the ancient Paulicians, and thereby with the Manichaeans, is pretty generally admitted, according to *Muratori*, Antiquitatum, T. V., p. 83 sq. *Gibbon*, Hist. of the Decline, etc., ch. 54.

§ 212. *Retrospect.*

Whole centuries had gone by since the Church of Christ was founded among the Germans, and still the masses of the people were not animated by that sober, earnest Christian spirit, which early sunk into the minds and hearts of the Greeks and Romans, and quickened those great nations into new and vigorous life.

The difference of result in the two peoples is undoubtedly to be sought for in their peculiar traits of character, and in the degree of civilization which each had reached before embracing Christianity. To these causes should be added the anomalous and disturbed condition of the various European States, occasioned by the invasions of the migrating nations, by the absence or inefficiency of all authority, and the consequent lawlessness reigning in the Frankish Empire; by the inroads of the Saracens, the ravages of the Normans and Hungarians, and by numerous civil wars. Once all these circumstances, and their necessary tendency to retard the spread of religion, are taken into account, the marvel will no longer be that the aspect of Christendom, at the close of this epoch, presented so few hopeful signs, but that it presented so many. On the one hand, the Church checked, if she did not fully restrain, the licentious morals of the age;

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 757.

[2] Gesta Episcopor. Leodiens., c. 59 (*Martène* et *Durand.* Amplissima Collectio, T. IV., p. 898 sq.) Cf. on *Vazon*, Hist. litt. de la France, T. VII., p. 588 sq., and above, p. 422, note 3.

and on the other, the people themselves combined, in self-defense, to suppress the evils of the times. Every one was looking forward in the hope that some one, with the genius to set things in order and act the part of a deliverer, would appear. Princes alone, and the corrupt among the clergy, dreaded his coming. Hence Christendom hailed the rising power of the Papacy with joy, and looked hopefully forward to the influence which it was shortly to exert. Every one believed that the Pope, and he alone, possessed the courage and strength necessary to grapple with and overcome the evils that menaced both Church and State.

Again, there were here and there evidences of a scientific tendency; and it soon became clear that a fuller and more exact knowledge of Christian dogmas was needed. In the midst of these evils, there were not wanting men of piety and solid worth who gave promise of a better condition of things. The controversies on *Adoptionism*, on *Predestination*, and the *Eucharist*, while rendering the perception of religious truths more sensitive, strengthened and cultivated the reasoning powers of the mind, when exercised within the domain of theology. The spirit of the Church penetrated and permeated the laws of the State. We have proofs of this statement at a very early date, in the *Lex Alemannica* and the *Lex Visigothorum;* but its most complete verification is to be found in the Capitularies of the Frankish kings.

As this epoch was drawing to a close, the relations of Church and State were coming to be satisfactorily adjusted, and society was being gradually organized.

SECOND EPOCH.

FROM GREGORY VII. (A. D. 1073) TO THE OPENING OF THE WESTERN SCHISM, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

THE PAPACY IN THE MIDDLE AGES—HEIGHT AND DECLINE OF ITS POWER.

PART FIRST.

RISE AND HEIGHT OF THE PAPAL POWER IN THE MIDDLE AGES, FROM THE ACCESSION OF GREGORY VII. TO THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. (A. D. 1073–1303.)

The two great lights and the two swords. Genes. i. 16; Luke xxii. 38.

§ 213. *Outline—Sources and Works Referring to Them.*

Whatever of civilization or mental culture is possessed by the Germans owes its origin to Christianity. Again, it is entirely due to the authority and influence of the *Popes* that Christianity was preached to them at all, and that the Church was established in their midst. Rome was at a very early day the center and source of all religious and political life. When the various German tribes separated from each other and formed themselves into distinct nations, and every State and nearly every municipality manifested an inclination to break with every other State and municipality and set up independently for themselves, the *Popes*, and they alone, started the idea of Catholic unity, organized this heterogeneous mass of peoples into one great Christian confederation, capable of undertaking and successfully prosecuting vast and momentous enterprises. The practical development of this idea was greatly facilitated by the *alliance between* the Church and the empire—between the Church of Christ and *a thoroughly Christian empire.* So necessary and vital was this alliance, and so extensive its operation, that all Christian countries were affected by it, and their progress or decline depended upon either the union or the alienation of the two powers.[1]

But when the Emperor, in place of being the protector, became the *oppressor* of the Church; when the Church, by reason of the fiefs she possessed, became the slave of princes and feudal lords; when these *put on sale ecclesiastical rights and benefices*, or used them to reward their own creatures; when they forced upon the Church an *unchaste* and *dissolute* clergy, and assumed, without any title of right, the office of administering ecclesiastical affairs, thus paralyzing the Church's normal action and interfering with her legitimate influence; then, as if by a spontaneous outgrowth and issue of the times, the necessity of which was recognized by the greatest minds of the age, not only was all spiritual power little by little centered in the Pope, but the world acknowledged that in him resided *the principle of spiritual supremacy; that he was God's representative on earth, and, as a consequence, superior to every temporal authority and power.* He alone was equal to the task of lifting the Church from the depth of degradation into which she had been plunged, of emancipating her from the servitude of princes and the insubordination and simony of a dissolute clergy, and of restoring her to her former dignity and beneficent authority. He, too, was the protector of national liberties, the vindicator of the rights of individuals, the enemy of every sort of tyranny and oppression; the one, in fine, to whom every eye was turned in anticipation of the triumph of morality and the restoration of Christian civilization.

The whole Christian hierarchy, from the Head of the Church down to the most humble and obscure of her members, were all inspired and animated by the true Christian spirit; and it is this earnest appreciation of religious influences that impresses upon the second epoch of the Middle Ages the serious cast which is its special characteristic.

---

[1] Cf. § 184.

It was from motives of duty, not ambition, that the great Popes of this epoch, such as Gregory VII., Alexander III., Innocent III., and others, contended for the fullness of power. The contest was for them a duty forced upon them by the peculiar circumstances of their position, and, as such, it was in the event triumphant. They not only welcomed and sought to give practical expression to every noble thought and generous aspiration of their age, but, as a rule, had the marvelous good fortune to see their efforts crowned with complete success. The term of years during which the Popes exercised a direct influence upon society constitutes a grand epoch, filled with events that *will ever retain their hold on the memory of man.* Such were the Crusades, the establishment of universities, the development of the science of theology, both scholastic and mystic, the formation of a national poetry based upon truly religious principles and inspired by religious feeling and sentiment, the exuberant growth of monastic life, and, finally, the splendid achievements in every department of art.

I. SOURCES.—Very important sources in the following collections: *Canisii* Lectt. antiquae, Ingolst. 1601, ed. *Basnage*, Antv. 1725, 4 T., f. *D'Achéry*, Vett. Scriptor. Spicileg., Par. 1653, ed. *de la Barre*, 1723, 3 T., f. *Baluzii* Miscellanea, Par. 1678, ed. *Mansi*, Luc. 1761, 4 T., f. *Mabillon*, Vett. Analecta, Par. 1723, f. *Martène* et *Durand*, Thes. novus anecdotorum, Par. 1717, 5 T., f., and by the *same* authors: Vett. Scriptor. et Monum. coll. amplissima, Par. 1724 sq., 9 T., f. *Petz*, Thesaur. Anecdot. Aug., Vind. 1721, 6 T., f. **Pertz*, Monumenta Germ., T. VII.-XIV.—Regesta Rom. Pontificum until 1198, ed. *Jaffé;* Regesta regum atque imperat. Rom., Extracts and observations by *Böhmer*, Frankfort, 1831, in 4to. *Böhmer*, The Laws of the Empire, from 900–1400. — — The Chronicles, *Hermann. Contract.*, continued by *Bertholdus* of Reichenau until 1080; epitomized and continued by *Bernoldus* of St. Blaise until 1100. *Lambertus Hersfeldensis; Marian. Scotus;* Siegbert. Gemblac., *Chronicon Urspergense* (Pars I. to 1126; Pt. II. to 1229), Argentor. 1609, f. *Annalista Saxo*, to 1139 (Eccard. Corp. Hist. Med. Aevi, T. I.; *Pertz*, T. VIII.-X.) *Otto*, Episc. *Frising.* († 1158), Chron., libb. VIII., to 1146, continued by Otto de St. Blasio to 1209 (Urstis., T. I.; Usserm., T. II. See *Wattenbach*, Germany's Sources of History, 2d ed., p. 403). *Alberti Stadens.*, Chron. to 1256 (Schilteri Scriptt. rer. Germ.) *Chronica regia* s. Sti. Pantaleon. (Monastery of Cologne), continued by Godefridus to 1273 (Eccard., T. I.; Freher., T. I., p. 335). *Alberici*, monk of Drübeck, in the territory of Liége, Chron. to 1241, from 1106, original (Leibn. Accessionib. Hist., T. II.) *Matthaei Paris.* († 1259), Hist. Major., 1066–1259, continued to 1276, ed. Wats., Lond. 1640, f. *Martini Poloni* († 1278), Chron. (in *Schilter;* continued to 1243, in Eccard., T. I.; see above, the beginning of § 182.) *Vincent. Bellovacens.* († 1264), Specul. Historiale, libb. XXXII. (Argentor. 1473, 4 vol., f.) Duaci, 1624, exclusively Church History. *Adam Bremensis*, from 1067, canon of Bremen, Hist. Eccl., libb. IV. (in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 146.) *Odoric. Vital.*, monk of St. Evreuil († after 1142), H. E., libb. XIII., to 1142 (*du Chesne*, Scriptt. Normann.) *Ptolemaei de Fiadonib.*, H. E., to 1316 (*Muratori*, T. XI.) Cf. * *Wattenbach*, Germany's Sources of History, 2d ed., Brl. 1866, p. 293 sq.

Greek Historians, the Byzantines.—Joh. Zonaras, see Vol. I., p. 43. They are joined by *Nicetas Acominatus*, from 1117 to 1206; *Georg. Acropolita*, 1204–1261, ed. *Leo Allatius*, Par. 1651, f., and in the Corp. Scriptt. Hist., *Byzant.*, Bonn., 1828 sq. *Georg. Pachymeres.*, 1258–1308, ed. Possinus, Rom. 1661, sq., 2 T., f. Imm. Bekker, Bonn. 1835. *Niceph. Gregoras.*, 1204–1359, ed. Boivinus, Par. 1702, 2 T., f., and in the ed. Bonnens.

II. WORKS.—*Baronii* Annales, to 1198 and the continuators (see Vol. I., p. 45). *Fleury*, Hist. Ecclesiast. — The excellent Monographies of Gregory VII., by *Voigt* and by *Gfrörer*, and by the Englishman, *Bowden;* of Innocent III., by *Hurter;* of Boniface VIII., by *Tosti;* also, the biographies of prominent men, authors, and poets. Among *Profane Historians:* †*Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, T. VI.–VIII.; *Moeller*, Précis de l'histoire du moyen âge, p. 273–414 (troisième période depuis S. Greg. VII. jusqu' à la mort de Boniface VIII., 1073–1303. *Heeren-Ukert*, Hist. of the European States. *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Univ. Hist., Vol. VI., p. 233 sq. *Luden*, Hist. of the German People, Vol. VIII.–XII., p. 323. *Damberger*, Synchronistical History, Vol. VII.–XII. †Cesare Cantù, Univ. Hist., Vol. VI. † *Weiss*, Text-book of Univ. Hist., Vol. II.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

Among the SOURCES: *Jaffé*, Regesta Rom. Pontif., p. 402 sq. Vitae Pontificum Romanor.—ab aequalibus conscriptae, ed. * *Watterich*, T. I., p. 291 sq.; T. II., to Coelestinus III., †1198. — Among the WORKS: Principally those of *Papencordt*, Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 207 sq.; *Gregorovius*, same title of work, Vols. IV. and V., and *von Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II., p. 366 sq. *Fleury* and *Döllinger*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 131–276; Engl. transl., Vol. III., p. 272 sq. Cf. *Haas*, Hist. of the Popes, Tübg. 1860, p. 279–423; *Groene*, Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II., Ratisb. 1866. **Phillips*, Canon Law, Vol. II., Pt. I.

A.—FROM GREGORY VII. TO CALIXTUS II.—FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTEST ON INVESTITURES UNTIL ITS TERMINATION BY THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS (A. D. 1122).

§ 214. *Pope Gregory VII.* (A. D. 1073–1085.)*

Gregorii VII. Registri s. epp., libb. XI. (lib. X. wanting), in *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 60–391. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1195–1515, but compare *Udalrici* Babenbergens. Codex Epistolar., collected about 1125 (*Eccard.* Corp. Hist., T. II.); ed. *Jaffé*, Berol. 1865 (Bibl. rerum Germ., T. II.) When Gregory VII. was grossly misrepresented and his memory shamefully insulted, his defense was taken up by the Protestants *Gaab*, Apology of Pope Gregory VII., Tübg. 1792, and Vindication of Gregory VII., Presburg and Freiburg, 1786, 2 vols. *John von Müller*, *Luden*, *Rühs*, *Leo*, Lectures on German History, Vol. II. *Voigt*, Hildebrand as Pope Gregory VII. (Weimar, 1815), Vienna, 1819; 2d ed., Weimar, 1846, transl. into French by Abbé Jaeger, 1837. *Bowden*, Life of Gregory VII., London, 1840, 2 vols.—very important. — †*Gfrörer*, Pope Gregory VII. and his Age, Schaffhausen, 1859 sq., 7 vols. *Giesebrecht*, Hist. of the Period of German Emperors, Vol. III., Pts. I. and II. †*Davin*, Gregoire VII., Tournai, 1867. **Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. V., p. 1–166.

An ominous silence, such as precedes a storm, settled upon Rome when Alexander II. passed out of this world. His remains had hardly been laid in their resting-place when both clergy and people cried out with one accordant voice, "Hildebrand! Hildebrand! He it is whom St. Peter has chosen to be his successor." To comply with an article of the decree of Nicholas II. on papal elections, the cardinals and the Roman clergy confirmed the popular choice.

---

*Among contemporary writers FOR Gregory, *Bonizo* (see Lit. heading of § 188); *Paulus Bernridens.*, de Vita Gregorii VII. (*Mabillon*, Acta SS. Ord. S. B. saec. VII., Pt. II., and *Muratori*, Scriptor., T. II., Pt. I., with other defenders in *Gretseri* opp., T. VI.); *Bruno*, Hist. Belli Saxon., from 1073–1082 (*Pertz*, T. VII.) *Bernoldus*, Presbyt. Constant., Hist. sui temporis, 1054–1100, being a continuation of *Hermann. Contract.* (*Usserm.* Monum., T. II.) AGAINST Greg-

Hildebrand had already filled high and responsible positions in Rome, had frequently gone on distant and complicated missions, and knew well the difficulties that would beset one who should endeavor to govern the Church as became an upright and conscientious Pope. Hence, dreading the responsibility, he protested, but to no purpose, against his own elevation to the papal throne. He was invested with the purple and crowned with the tiara, April 22, A. D. 1073. Forced, against his own will, to accept the exalted position of the papacy, and, modestly shrinking from its onerous duties, Gregory thought he saw one way still open by which he might escape the burden. The last decree on papal elections contained an article requiring that the Pope-elect should receive the approval of the Emperor of Germany. Gregory, who still assumed only the title of "*Bishop-elect of Rome*," notified Henry IV., King of Germany and Emperor-elect, of what had taken place, and begged him not to approve the action or confirm the choice of the Romans. "But should you," he went on to say, "deny my prayer, I beg to assure you that I shall most certainly not allow your scandalous and notorious excesses to go unpunished."[1] Several historians,

---

ory, *Benno*, Cardinal of the Antipope Clement III., de vita et gestis Hildebrandi, libri II. (a libel, bristling with contradictions); *Benzo*, Bishop of Alba, in Piemont, Panegyricus rhythmicus in Henricum IV. Imperatorem (*Menken*, Scriptor. rer. German., T. I., p. 957; *Menken's* bad text materially improved in *Pertz*, T. XI., p. 507–568). Cf. *Will*, Benzo's Panegyric on Henry IV., etc., Marburg, 1856; Latin essay on Benzo, by *Vogel*, Jena, 1850; by *Hennes*, Bonnae, 1865; by *Krueger*, Bonnae, 1865. *Otbert*, Bishop of Liége, de vita et obitu Henrici IV. (*Goldasti*, Apolog. pro Henr. IV., Hannoveriae, 1611, 4to.)—Chroniclers: *Lambert* of Hersfeld, *Marianus Scotus*, *Otho of Freising;* even *Siegbert* often acknowledges the worth of Gregory. Cf. *Stenzel*, Hist. of Germany under the Frankish Emperors, Vol. II., p. 55.

[1] Ne assensum praeberet, attentius exoravit. Quod si non faceret, certum sibi esset, quod graviores et manifestos ipsius excessus nullatenus impunitos toleraret in *Baron.* ad a. 1073, nr. 27. *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 148, p. 114 sq. Cf.

putting this bold declaration beside the decree of Nicholas II. (A. D. 1059),[1] which went on the assumption that the King of Germany did not enjoy the right of approving the Pope-elect until after he had been crowned Emperor, and then, only by a concession made to himself personally, have pronounced it supposititious. But when it is recollected that its authenticity rests upon the combined testimony of *Bonizo*, Bishop of Sutri, the friend of Hildebrand, and of *William*, abbot *of Metz*, as well as on the authority of the *Acta Vaticana*, it is difficult to see how the objection can be sustained. Moreover, it will be remembered that Hildebrand himself had a hand in the framing and enactment of the statute on papal elections; and hence, lest it should now be supposed that he had then purposely limited the scope of the imperial privilege of approval, in view of his own elevation at some future day to the papal throne, he now forewent a right on which he might have fairly insisted, and, in order to dissipate any suspicion of dishonest dealing, requested the ratification of the Emperor-elect.

Again, Hildebrand thought it best to yield, for the present, for another reason. When the news of the decree on papal elections reached Germany, the current of popular feeling ran strong against the Popes; and Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne, during his residence at Rome, in 1068, had represented to the papal court the possible consequences of such irritation in strong and emphatic language. Under these circumstances, it was deemed prudent not to evoke unnecessarily a storm which it might be difficult to allay.

Henry IV., on receiving news of Hildebrand's election, sent Count Eberhard, of Nellenburg, as his plenipotentiary to Rome to protest against the proceeding. The politic Hildebrand was careful not to be taken at a disadvantage. "I have indeed," said he, "been elected by the people, but against my own will. I would not, however, allow myself to be forced to take priest's orders until my election should have been ratified by the king and the princes of Germany."

Hefele, Hist. of Councils, Vol. V., p. 1–10, where there is full proof of the authenticity of this declaration.

[1] See p. 326.

Lambert of Hersfeld informs us that Henry was so pleased with this manner of speech that he gave orders to allow the consecration to go on, and the ceremony was accordingly performed on the Feast of the Purification in the following year (A. D. 1074). This is the *last instance of a papal election being ratified* by an *emperor*. Still, the *great Catholic powers* have continued to exercise a greater or less influence on papal elections down to our own day. Out of respect to the memory of Gregory VI., his former friend and master, Hildebrand, on ascending the papal throne, took the ever illustrious name of *Gregory VII.*

Once seated upon the pontifical throne, Gregory proceeded, with greater vigor than he had ever before exhibited, *against such bishops and abbots as had obtained their appointments uncanonically from temporal princes, and against simonists and immoral ecclesiastics.* He at once set himself to reform the abuses and scandals of the Church, the existence of which he constantly deplores in letters.[1] "*I have often*," says he, *besought God either to take me out of this world or to make me useful to our common mother, the Church; but He has neither set me free from my great sufferings, nor has He, as I have besought Him, made me of use to the mother whom I so dearly love.*" He then goes on to describe the deplorable condition of the Church. "*The Eastern Church has lost the true faith, and is now assailed on every side by infidels. In whatever direction one turns his eyes—to the West, to the North, or to the South—everywhere are to be found bishops who have obtained the episcopal office in an irregular way; whose lives and conversation are out of harmony with their calling; who go through their duties, not from love of Christ, but from motives of worldly ambition. There are no longer princes now who set God's honor before their own selfish ends, or who allow justice to stand in the way of their ambition.*' And, speaking of the men of his time, he says: "*Those among whom I live—Romans, Lombards, and Normans—are as I have often told them, worse than Jews and Pagans. And as for myself*," he adds, "*I am so weighed down with the enormity*

---

[1] *Gregor.* epp., libb. II., ep. 49. *Metzler*, The legislation and other efforts of Gregory VII. to purify the election of Bishops, Lps. 1868.

of my sins that I can hope for pardon only from the abundant mercy of Christ. And did I not live in the hope of one day leading a more perfect life and serving our holy Church more faithfully, I should certainly not remain in Rome, where, as God is my witness, I have lived these twenty years past only by constraint. Thus it comes to pass that I am placed between fear and hope—fear daily renewed and hope indefinitely deferred—driven to and fro by ceaseless storms, living in the midst of death, and dying in the fullness of life."

Gregory, with admirable foresight, commenced his great work with the *reformation of the clergy.* He first of all assembled a numerously attended synod at Rome (A. D. 1074), and revived all the *old* decrees against incontinency, enjoining their observance under the severest penalties. This he considered the only efficient means of restoring and preserving among the clergy the moral purity of life which their state demanded. In no other way could they be so detached from the world and worldly affairs as to devote themselves wholly to the services of the Church or be completely *independent of the State.* The decrees of Clement II., Leo IX., Victor II., Nicholas II., and Alexander II. had indeed called forth a stubborn resistance, but no such stormy opposition as this measure of Gregory. The reason is not far to seek. Gregory was in earnest, and meant to have the decree carried out to the letter; and, the better to put down any contumacious resistance, *made the people in a measure the executors of his will.*[1]

The married priests, of course, offered the most determined and pertinacious opposition.[2] Archbishops, bishops, and abbots who undertook to enforce the decrees were assaulted, and barely escaped with their lives from the fury of the assailants. But the only effect of measures so violent was to strengthen the determination of religiously minded men, and such as desired a more pure, a more intelligent, and a less worldly priesthood, to have nothing more to do with those

---

[1] *Gregory* says: Sed nec illi, qui in crimine fornicationis jacent, missas celebrare aut secundum inferiores ordines ministrare altari debent. Statuimus etiam, ut si ipsi fuerint contemtores nostrarum, *immo SS. Patrum* constitutionum (see § 85), *populi nullo modo illorum officia recipiant,* ut qui amore Dei et officii dignitate non corrigantur, verecundia saeculi et *objurgatione populi* resipiscant. (Ep. ad Otton. Episc. Const. See above, p. 327, n. 1.)

[2] *Lambert. Hersfeld.* ad a. 1074: Adversus hoc decretum infremuit tota factio clericorum; hominem plane haereticum et vesani dogmatis esse clamitans, qui oblitus sermonis Domini qui ait: non omnes capiunt hoc verbum, etc. All manner of objections were made against the obligation of the rule of celibacy

---

by the synods of Erfurt, Passau, and Paris, held in the year 1074. Passages of *St. Paul* were cited in support of their position, and against the Pope. Such were: "Melius est nubere quam uri" (1 Cor. vii. 2, 9); and "oportet episcopum irreprehensibilem esse, *unius uxoris* virum" (1 Tim. iii. 2; cf. Matt. xix. 11). The case of *Paphnutius*, at the Council of Nice, was also appealed to (see Vol. I., p. 656). The opponents of the rule of celibacy told the Papal legate, at *Nürnberg* (A. D. 1074), that "they would rather renounce the priesthood than their marriage contract, and that he for whom men were not good enough might go seek angels to preside over the churches" (in Lambert of Hersfeld). *Sigebert* of Gemblours says that many declared the prohibition against hearing the Mass of married priests an error of doctrine, inasmuch as the Church teaches that "the efficacy of the Sacraments is wholly independent of the worthiness of the minister." Such, however, was not the bearing of the prohibition, which was entirely disciplinary; and the Pope, while acknowledging the validity of such ministrations, simply wished to correct an abuse, by declaring them unlawful. The clergy of the dioceses of *Cambrai* and *Noyon* complained in two letters, written in the year 1076, both of Rome and of their own bishops, because their sons were not permitted to take holy orders. Cf. also *Martène*, Thesaurus Anecdotor., T. I., p. 320 sq.

But Gregory was decisive in the matter, and refused to depart a hair's breadth from what he conceived to be the true ideal of the priesthood. Hence he published in the same year the following imperative decree: "Si qui sunt presbyteri vel diaconi vel subdiaconi, qui in crimine fornicationis jaceant, *interdicimus eis* ex Dei parte omnipotentis et sancti Petri auctoritate *ecclesiae introitum*, usque dum poeniteant et emendent. Si qui vero in peccato suo perseverare maluerint, *nullus vestrum eorum audire praesumat officium:* quia benedictio eorum vertitur in maledictionem et oratio in peccatum, Domino testante per Prophetam: Maledicam, *inquit*, benedictionibus vestris." (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 433, Grat. decret. dist. 81, c. 15.) When occasion required, Gregory could also command words full of dignity and elevation of thought, and well calculated to call forth a noble enthusiasm among the priesthood. "Multum namque," says he in one of his epistles, "debet nobis videri pudendum, quod quilibet saeculares milites quotidie pro terreno principe suo in acie consistunt, et necis perferre discrimina vix expavescunt: et nos, qui sacerdotes Domini dicimur, non pro illo nostro rege pugnemus, qui omnia fecit ex nihilo, quique non abhorruit mortis pro nobis subire dispendium, nobisque promittit meritum sine fine mansurum." (*Greg.* epp., libb. III., ep. 4; *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 190; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1326 sq.) There were also bishops who shared with Gregory this high ideal of the priesthood. Such was *Hanno*, Archbishop of Cologne, who, on taking charge of the political affairs of Henry IV., is thus described by *Lambert* of *Hersfeld:* "Eo moderamine, eà industria atque auctoritate rem tractabat, ut profecto ambipriests who refused to yield obedience to the laws of the Church, or to strengthen the authority of the Pope.[1]

Simony being closely connected with the sin of incontinency, Gregory felt that to effectually correct the latter it was necessary to entirely eradicate the former. But to accomplish this, it was further necessary to put an end to the *practice* of *investiture*, and to withdraw from the laity, once for all, the power of appointing to spiritual offices. Hence, in a second synod, held at Rome[1] (A. D. 1075), it was enacted that, "*if any person should accept a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman, such one should not be regarded as a bishop or an abbot, nor should he enter a church until he had given up the place thus illegally obtained.*" It was further enacted that "*the same rule should apply to the lower offices of the Church, and that any person, even if he were emperor or king, who should confer an investiture in connection with any ecclesiastical office, should be cut off from the communion of the Church.*" The real intent and scope of this decree, though not apparent upon its face, were evident enough. It raised the bishops out of their condition of feudal servitude and provided for the freedom of ecclesiastical elections. These provisions, Gregory declared, were a necessity, and not arbitrary or of his own making; neither were they innovations, but, on the contrary, the *very ancient practice of the Church.*

It has been frequently asserted, but without any sufficient reason, that the leading idea of Gregory's life was the establishment of a *universal monarchy*, with the Pope at its head and the princes and kings of the earth doing him homage and service as his *vassals*. His very strongest utterance, re-

---

geres, Pontificali eum an Regio nomine digniorem judicares, atque in rege ipso, qui in cultu atque socordia paene praeceps ierat, paternam virtutem et paternos mores brevi exsuscitaret." (Conf. *Palma*, Praelectiones hist. eccl., T. III., p. 19 sq.; *Giles Müller*, Hanno II., Lps. 1858; *Lindner*, Anno II., the holy Archbishop of Cologne, 1869). Then, *Gebhard*, Archbp. of Salzburg; *Altman*, Bp. of Passau (Vita Altm. in *Pertz*, T. XII., p. 226–243; *Stülz*, Life of Bp. Altman of Passau, Vienna, 1853); *Adalbero*, Bp. of Würzburg, and others. Cf. the exhaustive apologetical treatise on the laws of Celibacy, by *Bernold* of Constance, in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 148; in *Mansi*, T. XX.; in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I.

[1] On these two councils, see *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 403 sq.; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1521 sq., and *Palma*, l. c., T. III., p. 8–18.

quiring whosoever should be elected King of Germany after the death of Rudolph of Suabia to promise on oath to render *military service* (militia) to the Holy See, far from making the king a vassal, does no more than constitute him the protector and defender of the rights and possessions of the Roman Church.[1] Neither can the tax exacted from the various princes and countries be considered a *feudal tribute*. Except in particular cases, where a prince or province was bound by special treaty to render all the obligations of feudal dependencies to the Holy See, the tax was no more than a token of devotion, by which was expressed the submission of the giver, on the one hand, and on the other, the spiritual authority of the Sovereign Pontiff.[2]

Finally, as regards the sentiment attributed to Gregory relative to the origin of the civil power, the Protestant historian, *Neander*, has the following pertinent remarks:[3] "We find Gregory," says the writer, "entertaining an idea, which is expressed also in other writings of this party, according to which the priestly authority would appear to be the only one truly ordained of God—the authority by which everything was finally to be brought back into the right train—'*for the authority of princes grew originally out of sinful self-will, the primitive equality of mankind having been broken up by the violence of those who, by rapine, murder, and every other species of atrocity, elevated themselves above their equals;*'[1] a view which might be confirmed, in the minds of some, on contemplating the then condition of civil society. Yet, in other places, when not pushed by opposition to this extreme, *he recognizes the kingly authority as also ordained of God;* only maintaining that it should confine itself within its proper limits, remaining subordinate to the papal power, which is sovereign over all. He says that *the two authorities stand related to each other as sun and moon*, and compares them to the two eyes of the body."[2]

---

[1] *Gregor*. epp., lib. IX., ep. 3 ad Episc. Pataviens.: Qua de re quid promissionis sacramento sancta Rom. ecclesia ab illo (qui est eligendus in regem) requirat, in sequenti significamus: ab hac hora et deinceps *fidelis ero per rectam fidem* beato Petro Apost. ejusque vicario papae Gregorio, qui nunc in carne vivit, et quodcunque mihi ipse papa praeceperit, sub his videlicet verbis: *per veram obedientiam* fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo. De ordinatione vero ecclesiarum et de terris vel censu, quae Constantinus imper. vel Carolus sancto Petro dederunt, et de omnibus ecclesiis vel praediis, quae apostolicae sedi ab aliquibus viris vel mulieribus aliquo tempore sunt oblata vel concessa, et in mea sunt vel fuerint potestate, ita conveniam cum papa, ut periculum sacrilegii et perditionem animae meae non incurram: et Deo sanctoque Petro adjuvante Christo dignum honorem et utilitatem impendam: et eo die, quando illum primitus videro, *fideliter per manus meas miles sancti Petri et illius efficiar*. Those historians who make so much of this oath, should not omit to mention that the Pope, in this very letter (which is addressed to the Bishop of Passau), as if anticipating that some might misinterpret the meaning, and be offended by the tenor of the oath, adds the following words in explanation: Verum quoniam religionem tuam apostolicae sedi fidelem et promissis tenemus et experimentis non dubitamus, de his, si quid minuendum vel augendum censueris, non tamen *praetermisso integro fidelitatis modo et obedientiae promissione, potestati tuae et fidei, quam beato Petro debes*, committimus. (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 343; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1481.) And this is, in effect, no more than what Henry II. solemnly promised to Pope Benedict VIII. See p. 314, n. 1.

[2] See above, p. 334.

[3] Cf. *Neander*, Ch. H., Eng. transl. by *Torrey*, 11th Amer. ed., Vol. IV., p. 87.

That this is a just estimate of Gregory's principles is proved, *first*, from many open expressions of his opinions, in which he sets forth the necessity of the harmonious action of the spiritual and temporal powers. "In the same measure," says Gregory,[3] "that union between royalty and the priesthood becomes more intimate and harmonious, will the temporal power be more equitably wielded and the ecclesiastical life more firmly established;" and, *next*, from the many and strenuous efforts of Gregory *to protect and defend the temporal power.*

We are inclined to think that the following words of *Hefele* give a correct idea of Gregory's policy:[4] "Seeing the world sunk in wickedness and threatened with impending ruin, and believing that the Pope alone could save it, Gregory conceived the vast design of forming a *universal theocracy*, which should embrace every kingdom of Christendom, and of whose polity the Decalogue should be the fundamental principle. Over this commonwealth of nations the Pope was to preside. The spiritual power was to stand related to the temporal as the *sun* to the *moon*, imparting light and strength, without, however, destroying it or depriving princes of their sovereignty. *On the other hand, temporal princes were to be obliged to bow before the supremacy of God's law, and to recognize Him as the source of their own jurisdiction and power.* Should any prince refuse to render this homage, he was to be at once cut off from the body of princes composing the theocratic alliance, denied the privileges attaching to membership, and declared incapable of being the representative of God among the Christian people. Thus, when all the thrones of the earth should lean upon the Apostolic See, then, and then only, would justice, harmony, peace, and unity reign throughout the world."[1]

---

[1] In the famous letter to Bishop Herman of Metz, l. VIII., ep. 21.

[2] Lib. I., ep. 19.

[3] *Gregorii* epp., lib. I., ep. 19, ad an. 1073.

[4] *Hefele*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. V., p. 16 sq.; *Luden*, Hist. of the Germ. People, Vol. VIII., pp. 468, 471; and *Rühs*, Manual of Hist. of Mid. Ages, 2d ed., p. 367, gives a similar explanation of Gregory's leading idea. The latter concludes thus: "The inspiring motive of Gregory's whole life was the realization of this idea (i. e. as the author gives it in his text), and not any vain ambition. Notwithstanding that the ideas, which swayed men in those ages, *have no application in our own*, the disciples of the so-called modern philosophy, indulging in a confusion of ideas, for which there is no excuse, and judging Gregory by our standard, have frequently underrated and misinterpreted him."

Judging the actions of Gregory according to this ideal standard, they become intelligible and consistent. His design, which aimed at making the principles of Christianity the source of the political life of the State, was a grand one, and one which, in that *age of violence*, was assuredly approved by those noble and generous souls who felt keenly the necessity of some great moral authority capable of overawing and holding in check the brutal violence of the temporal power. The idea of a *universal theocracy* did not, however, originate with Gregory. It has been ascribed to him because he drew it out in precise form, elaborated it into a complete and perfect system, and closely adhered to it throughout his whole administration. The *subordination* of *the temporal to the spiritual power*, resulting from the system, had already been proclaimed by *St. Gregory Nazianzen* and *St. Chrysostom*, and by the holy Popes *Gelasius* and *Gregory the Great;* and practically and generally recognized by the payment of Peter's pence and other similar offerings, which the German nations had been sending to Rome since the date of their conversion.[1] Besides the venerable antiquity and high authority upon which this conviction rested, it was further strengthened by *the relations of the feudal system.* Princes regarded their kingdoms as so many fiefs *held of God*, of which they might be deprived for any act of rebellion or high-treason against either Him or His Church. It belonged to the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ and the representative of God upon earth, to pass judgment in the premises. Such is the idea conveyed by the words, "Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolpho," inscribed upon the crown which Gregory VII. is said to have sent to the Emperor Rudolph, but the statement is not satisfactorily proven. Gregory was possessed of every qualification for carrying this idea into practical effect. To resolute moral courage and strength of will he added an unbounded devotion to the interests of the Church, and intellectual gifts of such eminence that he readily took in the most complicated facts, divined their solution, and applied a remedy. He was self-reliant without being presumptuous. Grave in his utterance and dignified in his conduct, he was neither vain of his personal merit nor proud of his power. His very enemies were forced to acknowledge that his morals were pure and his life above reproach. That his actions were always prompted by purely disinterested motives is shown from his noble reply to *Mathilda*, Queen of England,[1] and wife of William the Conqueror, who had made him an offer of whatever it was in her power to give. "*I had much rather hear*," says Gregory in reply, "*that you lead a virtuous life, are charitable to the poor and loving to your neighbors, than to receive from you gold and jewels and the treasure of this world.*"

---

[1] It was not unlikely that power so extensive, when placed in the hands of one man, might at times lead to evil and pernicious consequences. Gregory himself appreciated the difficulty, and made it one of the subjects treated of in his *Twenty-seven Short Maxims*, called his *Dictates* (Dictatus Gregorii), relating to the laws and government of the Church. (Lib. II., ep. 55; *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 168 sq.; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1304.) In these, Gregory gives a comprehensive view of what constitutes the greatness and supremacy of Papal authority; draws out the system which he endeavored to introduce in the government of the Church, and shows how the temporal is subordinated to spiritual power. *Baron.*, ad an. 1076, n. 31, considers these Dictates *authentic; Christian. Lupus*, in Notes et Dissert. ad Concilia, holds the same opinion; *Launoi* (epp., lib. VI., ep. 13); *Pagi*, Crit. in *Baron.* ad an. 1077, n. 8; *Nat. Alex.*, Hist. Eccl. Saec. XI. et XII., dissert. III., believe them *spurious*. Others, again, and probably with good reason, say that the Dictates are the sentiments and principles of Gregory, arranged by an unskillful compiler. Thus, *Schroeckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXV., p. 519–521, and *Neander*, Hist. of the Christ. Relig. and Church, Eng. transl., Vol. IV., p. 120 (Orig. Germ., Vol. V., p. 157). See also *Giesebrecht*, Legislation of the Roman Church (Munich Historical Annuary, 1866, p. 149).

---

[1] *Gregory M.* epist., lib. III., ep. 65: Ut terrestre regnum coelesti regno famuletur. Cf. our Vol. I., p. 650, n. 1, and Vol. II., p. 151, n. 1, and *Lingard*, Hist. of England, Vol. III. (Germ. transl. by *Salis*, Vol. III., p. 3.)

But Gregory, though sincerely pious, was far from being *narrow-minded.* Writing to the King of Denmark, he exhorted him to put a stop to the custom which permitted the persecution of innocent women as witches and as the causes of the evils that came upon the country in seasons of famine and pestilence. Again, Gregory, while placing a high estimate on monasticism and a renunciation of the world, would never approve this manner of life for such as were usefully engaged in secular pursuits and whose places could not be easily filled by others. These he regarded as having been called by God to their respective positions. Gregory held that love should be the measure and standard of everything. Writing to the margravine, *Beatrice*, and her daughter, *Mathilda*, he says: "The love we bear God should inspire us to love our neighbors, to succor the needy, and comfort the distressed. To act from this motive is, in my judgment, of greater merit than fasting, watching, and other good works, be they ever so numerous, because true love is superior to all other virtues."

In the meantime, a power had been growing up in Upper Italy which was at the disposal of Gregory. The margravine, *Beatrice* († A. D. 1076), and her daughter, *Mathilda*,[2] surnamed the second "*Deborah*," revered him as their spiritual father, and were only too happy to place their influence and their treasure at his command, were ever ready to protect him against the violence of his enemies, and to offer him a secure retreat within their castles in seasons of danger.

---

[1] *Gregor.* epp., lib. VII., ep. 26. Cf. lib. VII., ep. 21, ad Aconum regem Danorum.

[2] Her promise, in *Baron.* ad an. 1074, nr. 10: "Quod non tribulatio, non angustia, non fames, non periculum, non persecutio, etc., poterit eam separare a charitate Petri in Christo Jesu Domino nostro." *Schlosser* says: "His (Gregory's) life remained, as it had always been, without taint. This was admitted by his very worst enemies. The calumny which, later on, some attempted to attach

Germany, *more than any other country*, engaged the attention and called forth the energies of Gregory. Fully conscious that in him resided the plenitude of the binding and loosing power, and impelled by a sense of his great responsibility, he resolved to carry out the principles of reform upon which he had set his heart. But his efforts were to be met by the most violent opposition on the part of *Henry IV.*, a prince whom a vicious and deplorable education had rendered vacillating and light-minded, a debauchee and a despot. In his case, there was more call for the enforcement of the decrees on investitures than in that of any other prince.

Henry and his court resided, by preference, at *Goslar*, and from members of the collegiate chapter of this place, all of whom were notoriously immoral, he made nearly all of his selections for the bishoprics of Germany and Italy. As a consequence, these canons practiced all the arts of flattery and servility, in order to recommend themselves to the royal favor and secure ecclesiastical preferment. Gregory had declared from the outset that in proceeding against Henry he was actuated by the purest of motives, and bore to that prince personally the kindest of feelings. "No one," says he, in a tone of fatherly *correction*, "has his present and future glory more at heart than ourselves. We shall on the first occasion send nuncios to him who, acting from motives of parental

---

to his name in connection with this lady, is a miserable and ridiculous invention." (Univ. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 720.) And *Neander* likewise says: "The connection of the Pope with this lady was certainly of the purest character, and so it appears in his correspondence with her. The enthusiastic devotedness of the most strict and pious persons of the age testifies in favor of Gregory." . . . The impartial *Lambert of Hersfeld* remarks, concerning the relation of Mathilda to the Pope: "Tanquam patri vel domino sedulum exhibebat officium." . . . He then refers to the misrepresentations put on this relation: . . . "Sed apud omnes sanum aliquid sapientes luce clarius constabat, falsa esse, quae dicebantur." Engl. transl., Vol. IV., p. 113, note 1; Germ. orig., Vol. V., Pt. I., p. 197. (Tr.)

kindness and from a desire to give prudent counsel, will agree with him on a line of action which will promote at once the glory of the Church and his royal dignity. If he heed our counsel, we shall rejoice in his welfare as in our own."[1]

Henry, who was at this time closely pressed by the Saxons, wrote to the Pope a humble letter, confessing that he had plundered the possessions of the Church, bestowed ecclesiastical dignities upon unworthy persons, and given churches for a consideration to simonists and such as had entered the ministry of Christ from wrong motives. He closed by promising amendment in the future, but his promise was never kept. The severity of Gregory was anything but agreeable to the dissolute Henry. Had the King been left to himself, his better feelings might now and then have gained the ascendancy, but there were those about his immediate person who desired to make use of him as a champion of their cause, and who in consequence pressed him to assert his sovereign authority against the inflexible Gregory. Henry hesitated. His relations with the Saxons were still doubtful, and his mother, Agnes, and other prudent mediators kept him in check. But no sooner had he subdued the Saxons than he broke through all restraints and set the commands of the Pope and the laws of the Church at defiance. Learning that Henry had reinstated in their former offices the *imperial counselors excommunicated* by Alexander II., that he had stolen the precious stones from the churches and bestowed them upon his concubines,[2] and that he was unjustly oppressing the conquered Saxons, Gregory, in 1075, warned him, both by letter and private embassy, and in a tone of paternal solicitude, to change his course of life, and, in January of the following year, threatened him with excommunication. Henry, who was not in a frame of mind to patiently endure such treatment, insultingly dismissed the papal envoys and answered the summons of Gregory to appear at Rome and clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge, by calling upon the venal bishops and abbots of the empire to meet at Worms (January 24, A. D. 1076) for the purpose of deposing the Pope. These creatures of the royal bounty, who had been trained in the vicious and servile court of Goslar, readily answered the summons. At their head was Cardinal *Hugo Blancus*, whom Gregory had deprived of his dignity for forging false briefs, showing favor to simoniacal priests and for assuming to be the representative of the Roman senate and people. Cardinal Hugo read before the assembly a paper, drawn up in the form of a letter, in which the most serious charges were brought against the Pope. Although the Fathers were well aware that these were false and the proceeding irregular, they nevertheless seized upon the opportunity to pronounce sentence of deposition on Gregory, declaring that one so stained with crimes could not be Pope. Each one was required to declare, in writing, that he withdrew from the obedience of Gregory; and, of all those present, only *Adalbero*, Bishop of Würzburg, and *Herman*, Bishop of Metz, *protested* against the proceeding as *uncanonical;* but even these presently withdrew their protest on the representation of the Bishop of Utrecht, one of Henry's creatures, who appealed to them to sign the decree in virtue of the loyalty which, as sworn vassals, they owed to their liege lord.[1] "This shows," says *Neander*, "to what extent these bishops and abbots were willing to be employed as the blind tools of power, and how much they needed a severe regent

---

[1] *Gregory*, in lib. I., ep. 9, and in ep. 119, enumerates the reasons by which he considered himself bound to provide for the maintenance of Henry IV. Cf. *Hefele's* Hist. of Councils, Vol. V., pp. 9, 10.

[2] "Gemmae (ecclesiarum) autem distractae quibusdam meretriculis donatae sunt," it is said in the Hist. Archiepisc. Bremensium, in *Lindenbrog.*, p. 94; and in *Bruno*, Hist. Belli Saxonici, we read: "Binas vel ternas concubinas simul habebat, nec his contentus, cujuscunque filiam vel uxorem juvenem et formosam audierat, si seduci non poterat, sibi violenter adduci praecipiebat. Aliquando etiam ipse uno sive duobus comitatus, ubi tales esse cognoverat, in nocte per-

---

gebat, et aliquando acti sui mali compos efficitur, aliquando vero vix effugiebat, ne a parentibus amatae sive marito occideretur. Uxorem suam, quam nobilem et pulchram *suasionibus principum invitus duxerat*, sic exosam habebat, ut post nuptias celebratas eam a se separare quaereret, ut tunc quasi licenter illicita faceret, cum hoc quod licebat conjugium non haberet." (*Struve*, T. I., p. 176.) Henry's friends have shrugged their shoulders at this, excused him, but never contradicted the fact.

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 107.

at the head of the Church." This sentence was announced to the Pope in a letter addressed in the following terms: "*Henry*, King by the grace of God and not by the will of man, *to Hildebrand, no longer Pope, but a false monk*." The King was encouraged to proceed to these extremities by the daring violence of Cencius (Crescentius), a licentious Roman nobleman, who, occupying a stronghold in the very center of the city, and fearing the power and resolution of Gregory, formed a conspiracy against him, and on the vigil of Christmas, A. D. 1075, set upon him and cast him into prison in the tower of Cencius' castle. As soon as the imprisonment of the Pope became known, violent commotions broke out among the people who forced the conspirators to set him at liberty.

A synod, consisting of the simoniacal bishops of Lombardy, hastily convened at Piacenza, approved the action of the assembly of Worms.

Information of the proceedings at Worms reached Gregory just as he was opening the Lent-synod of 1076. He received the news with composure, and, with the concurrence of one hundred and ten bishops who expressed their readiness to lay down their lives for him and in defense of his outraged dignity, pronounced sentence of excommunication upon the Archbishop of Mentz and the Bishops of Utrecht and Bamburg, prohibited those who had co-operated with them from the exercise of ecclesiastic functions, and allowed a limited time to such as had acted against their will to give signs of repentance. He adopted similar measures against the bishops of Lombardy. At the request of the whole synod, and in presence of the empress Agnes, who remained faithful to the Church in spite of the shock such a course must have given to maternal feelings, Gregory next declared Henry excommunicate and incompetent to govern either in Germany or Italy, and released his subjects from their oath of fealty.[1]

---

[1] This was not an act of deposition, but a simple suspension of the exercise of royal authority, and a necessary consequence of excommunication. For, as the people might not hold intercourse with one under sentence of excommunication, so neither could on this account exercise his governing prerogatives. Cf. *Döllinger*, l. c., p. 300. (Tr.)

The action of Gregory was the occasion and signal for the outbreak of a violent and long-continued struggle between the *contending parties.* When arguments would not answer, swords were resorted to. Some of those engaged in the conflict were totally in the dark as to the real point at issue. Few, indeed, who espoused the cause of Henry seemed to understand that, according to the political ethics of that age, the subjects of a ruler *who had incurred the ban of the Church were, as a matter of course,* absolved from the obligations which lay upon them in virtue of their oath of allegiance.[1]

The *partisans of Henry* declared that the Pope, by presuming to release subjects from their oath of allegiance to princes, had set himself above every law human and divine, and stained himself with the guilt of a most heinous crime. Starting with the principle, that the power of princes is of divine origin, and of its nature independent, and appealing to the texts of the New Testament, which enjoin obedience to those in authority,[2] as its sanction, they contended that no power on earth could annul the obligations which subjects owed to their princes. As an example in point, they cited the case of the Apostles, who themselves yielded a willing obedience to *Pagan* magistrates, and taught that this obedience should be given to even such a monster as Nero.

The *opposite party,* while admitting to the full all that had been said of the sanctity of an oath, argued, that when an oath ran counter to the law of God, it, by this very circumstance, ceased to possess a binding force, and that, as a consequence, no oath given to a secular prince, of whatever character it might be, could possibly oblige one to obey him, when, going beyond his own domain, he invaded that of the Church, and resisted him to whom God had committed the governance of Christendom. Moreover, they added, a prince who has been

---

[1] Perhaps no one expressed himself stronger on this subject than the scholastic writer *Guenrich,* in a letter addressed to Gregory in the name of Dietrich, Bishop of Verdun. He says: "Non est novum, homines saeculares saeculariter sapere et agere; novum est autem et omnibus retro saeculis inauditum, pontifices regna gentium tam facile velle dividere." (*Martène* et *Durand,* Thesaur. nov. anecdot., T. I., p. 220 sq.) Gregory's course is defended in *Greg. VII.* epp., lib. IV., ep. 2; lib. VIII., ep. 21 ad Herimannum episc. Metensem. (*Mansi,* T. XX., p. 331 sq.; *Harduin,* T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1469 sq.) Cf. supplement in *Mansi,* T. XX., p. 377, Greg. ep. ad Germanos: "Audivimus inter vos quosdam de excommunicatione, quam in regem fecimus, dubitare ac quaerere, utrum juste sit excommunicatus, et si nostra sententia ex auctoritate legalis censurae, ea qua debuit deliberatione egressa sit." The defense of Gregory in *Gebhardi* Archiepisc. Salisburg. ep. ad Herimann. episc. Metens. (1081), in *Tengnagel.* Vett. Monum. ctr. Schismaticos, Ingolst. 1612, 4to. Cf. *Helfenstein,* Gregory VII., according to the Controversial Writings of His Age, Frankfort, 1856.

[2] Rom. xiii. 1 sq.; Peter ii. 13–17; Tit. iii. 1.

cut off from the fellowship of the Church, is, by this fact, rendered incapable of exercising any governing power, inasmuch as no one may have fellowship with him.[1] The civil law also recognizes this hardship, for it prescribes that an excommunicated prince shall be reconciled to the Church within *a year and one day* after he has been cut off from her communion.

Finally, in reply to those who appealed to the divine right of kings, they said it was necessary to distinguish between the legitimate use and the arbitrary abuse of authority, between kings and tyrants. A prince who should abuse his power and authority, would prove himself incapable of exercising either.

The doubts expressed by Herman, Bishop of Mentz, as to the legality of Gregory's course, were to no purpose. Gregory insisted that his acts were all lawful, and within the scope of his rightful authority. He cited, in justification of his course, the example of Pope Zachary, who deposed the last of the Merovingians, and released the Franks from their oath of allegiance to him; of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who *excommunicated* Theodosius the Great; and of many other popes and bishops, who, under similar circumstances, pursued a similar line of conduct; and concluded by asking, whether Christ, in giving to Peter the commission to feed His *whole* flock, and in conferring upon him the power of binding and loosing, had made any exception in favor of princes?

The ban pronounced upon Henry created a great commotion in Germany. He and his counselors, both secular and spiritual, who had also been excommunicated by the Pope, were carefully avoided by the bulk of the people. Henry's condition was unfortunate. Still young, the slave of many vicious habits, wayward and capricious, and needing counsel and support, he found himself on a sudden deserted by those whom he most desired to have about him. Even unprincipled men who had attached themselves to him from motives of self-interest, and the great German vassals who, out of a regard for their feudal obligations, had heretofore been loyal to him, both now gave him up and declared in favor of the Pope—the former because they had nothing more to expect from the King's favor, and the latter because they recognized the claims of a higher law to their obedience. Courtier bishops who had but lately shown an unseemly servility to the royal will, now expressed themselves penitent for their past conduct, and ready to submit to the lawful authority of the Vicar of Christ. The Saxons, on the first knowledge of Henry's excommunication, happy of an opportunity to avenge

---

[4] See above, p. 411.

the outrages of this tyrannous oppressor, flew to arms and remained in a chronic state of insurrection.

In the meanwhile, those immediately about the person of Henry did all in their power to inflame his anger and strengthen his resistance by representing to him that he should not heed an unjust ban, and that his enemies were "the enemies of the empire." Henry at first gave a willing ear to such representations; but, finding that his party was daily decreasing in numbers and influence, he sought to bring about a reconciliation by negotiation. But in this he was also unsuccessful, and, as affairs were rapidly coming to a crisis, something must be done.

In October of the year 1076, the spiritual and temporal princes of the nation assembled at *Tribur*. *Sieghard*, Patriarch of Aquileia, and *Altman*, Bishop of Passau, a man of eminent piety, appeared before the assembly as papal legates. They were the bearers of a letter from the Pope, in which the latter expressly stated that he did not wish Henry to be deprived of the throne. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed to leave the final decision to the Pope, who was to be invited for this purpose to a diet of princes to be opened at Augsburg on the coming feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin. It was further stipulated that in the meantime Henry should hold no converse with excommunicated persons; should, for the present, give up the administration of public affairs; and, if not reconciled to the Church within a twelvemonth, be declared forever incompetent to exercise the functions of government.[1] The last clause was inserted on the authority of "*an ancient law of the empire.*" Helpless, and deserted by every one, Henry consented to abide by these conditions; but, fearing that things might go worse with him if he awaited the action of the proposed diet, he resolved to anticipate the coming of Gregory into Germany, and hastily set out for Italy to obtain absolution from his censures at any cost.

Accompanied by his wife, Bertha, his young son, and one trusty friend of no rank, Henry crossed the Alps by the Mount Cenis pass, in the exceptionally cold winter of 1076–77. Gregory had made arrangements to meet the German delegates on the Italian frontier and proceed thence with them to Augsburg, and, in order to keep his appointment, set out on his journey twenty days in advance of the day agreed upon. In the meantime, embassadors arrived in Italy, bearing a message from Henry to the Pope. Henry expressed deep sorrow for what he had done, promised amendment for the future, and earnestly sued to be released from the censure of excommunication. Gregory refused to accede to their request in behalf of their master, whose *insolence* and numerous transgressions he animadverted upon with unusual severity of language.

---

[1] This decision, together with a long table of crimes and complaints against Henry, in *Lambert.* ad an. 1076. (*Pertz*, Monum., T. VII., pp. 252, 253.)

A variety of circumstances delayed the journey of Gregory to Germany, and, while he was still in Italy, Henry crossed the Alps and appeared as a suppliant before him. No sooner had Henry arrived than a large party of Italian nobles and bishops gathered about him and offered to do any service for him, provided he would consent to take up their cause and second their opposition to Gregory. The latter, fearing that the irresolute King might yield to their solicitations, and, in his present circumstances, seriously apprehensive of the result of so formidable a combination, withdrew to the castle of *Canossa*, belonging to his devoted friend, Margravine Mathilda of Tuscany. But Henry had no such intention. Circumstances demanded that he should at once have the ban of excommunication removed, and to this he steadily applied himself. The German bishops and nobles who, like himself, were under sentence of excommunication, put on the garb of penitents and went first to beg absolution from the Pope. Gregory listened graciously to their prayer, and consented to grant them absolution, but on condition that they should give unequivocal tokens of their sincerity. The bishops were required to fast for a day in cells, each by himself, after which they were kindly reproved and dismissed with a warning not to repeat the offense. But Gregory dealt more sternly with Henry. Knowing the treacherous character of the King, and fearing that he might have a detachment of troops lying in ambush at a convenient distance, the Pope adopted all necessary precautions.

Henry, following the advice of those who counseled unconditional submission, and impatient of delay because the anniversary of his excommunication was approaching, put aside the insignia of royalty, and, clad in a penitential garb, humbly knocked at the gate of the citadel, begging permission to enter. Having been admitted, he remained barefooted in the snow during the whole of the day, and, returning to the same place on the two following days, went through the same discipline, and, with tears in his eyes, begged to have his anathema removed.

When it is remembered that this was in the exceptionally cold winter of 1077, some idea may be had of the severity of Henry's penance. Impatient of delay and despairing of success, Henry was about to retire, but, previously to doing so, entered the neighboring chapel of St. Nicholas to pray, and, while there, prevailed upon Mathilda to intercede for him. The margravine engaged the good offices of the Italian seigneurs in his behalf, and their united prayers finally overcame the reluctance of the Pontiff. Gregory admitted the King to an audience, January 28th,[1] but, before absolving him, required, as preliminary conditions, that he should appear before *the proposed assembly, which was to be presided over by the Pope*, where an opportunity would be given him to reply to the charges of his opponents; that upon the issue of this court should depend his right to the kingdom, and that in the meantime he should observe no state, retain no mark of dignity, and should exercise no acts of regal power. Should he violate any of these conditions, he would again incur all his former ecclesiastical penalties.

---

[1] *Lambert.* ad an. 1076 gives a full account of this scene. Cf. *Hefele*, Gregory VII. and Henry IV. at Canossa, Tübg. Quart., 1861, p. 1–36, and Hist. of Council., Vol. V., p. 81 sq. It turns out, after a careful study of the sources, that the affair of Canossa was not so dreadful as it has been heretofore represented. The king did not remain barefooted in the snow before Canossa for three successive days and nights, but only from the morning to the evening of each of three days, returning to his lodgings at nightfall, "a mane usque ad vesperam;" neither was he destitute of all clothing on the upper part of his body, except a shirt. he wore "the garb of a penitent," or a hair-cloth shirt, over his ordinary dress Even *Floto* (Henry IV., Vol. II., p. 129) says: "At the approach of darkness—which, as the season was winter, came at an early hour—they withdrew to their lodgings, took their meals, and went to rest. On the following day, the same spectacle was repeated." *Fessler*, Pope Gregory VII. and Ecclesiastical Liberty, Innsbruck, 1850.

Had the German princes met, as proposed, with Gregory at their head, we should have had *a most striking example of the exercise of papal jurisdiction over kings.*

When these conditions had been fixed upon, Gregory went through the form of admitting Henry into the Church, after which he *celebrated Mass* and gave Holy Communion to Henry as a token of his sincere reconciliation to that prince.[1]

If the bearing of Gregory in regard to other delinquent princes—such, for example, as *Philip* of France, who had repudiated *Bertha*, his lawful wife, and was then unlawfully cohabiting with *Bertrada*—was marked with greater leniency than in the case of Henry, it was because a statesman as prudent as Gregory knew well how to adapt his policy to the circumstances in which he was placed, and did not care to be engaged at one time in a contest with all the princes of Christendom. When, however, there was a real call upon him to speak out, he was prompt and decisive, as in the instance of *Boleslaus, King of Poland.*[1]

---

[1] According to the narrative of *Lambert of Hersfeld*, Gregory, having come to the communion, turning about, said that the German king and his partisans had often openly affirmed that he employed unlawful means to reach the papal throne, and that his life was stained with crimes of such a character as would, according to the laws of the Church, exclude him from the priesthood. He further said that the German nobles were daily wearying him with accusations against their king, which, if true, would not only incapacitate him to govern his kingdom, but would put him beyond the pale of the Church. Then breaking the Host into two halves, Gregory took one part in his hand, saying, "Let this be the final proof of my innocence, that thereby Almighty God may clear me this day of the crimes of which I have been accused if I am innocent, and may strike me with sudden death if I am guilty." He then called upon Henry to receive the other half with a similar asseveration, but the king hesitated, asked a few moments to take counsel, and finally declined.

Many historians, such as *Stenzel* (Hist. of the Franconian Emperors, Pt. I., p. 411), severely reproach Gregory for his conduct on this occasion; while others, as, for example, *Neander* (l. c., Vol. IV., p. 115), regard it as bearing witness to the approval of a good conscience. Henry, as the same author says, was neither sufficiently sure of his innocence, nor sufficiently hardened against religious impressions, to subject himself, uncertain of the result, to such a trial.

On the other hand, *Luden* (Hist. of the Germ. People, Vol. IX., p. 580) has undertaken to prove, from intrinsic arguments, the improbability of the facts related in Lambert's narrative. For had Gregory really acted, as he is there represented to have done, he would have anticipated the decision of the German assembly. *Donizo* and *Waltram*, Bishop of Naumburg (in *Freher*, Vol. I., p. 816), both eye-witnesses, say no more than what has been given in the text. The fuller narrative of *Bonizo* (in *Oefele*, Vol. II., p. 816), which may be relied on, as he himself lived in the neighborhood, states that Henry really received Holy Communion from the hands of Gregory. This narrative probably furnished the basis of Lambert's fiction. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 88–90.

The event proved the Pontiff had but too much reason for his misgivings of Henry's sincerity. Seduced by the flatteries and promises of the Lombard barons and some of the Italian bishops, the German king disregarded the obligations of his oath. The German princes being naturally irritated at this faithlessness, assembled (March 15, A. D. 1077) at Forchheim, near Bamberg, and, in spite of the remonstrance of Gregory, elected *Rudolph, Duke of Suabia*, king in Henry's place.

Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, who had deserted the cause of Henry and was then engaged in a vain effort to collect the tithes in Thuringia, crowned the newly elected King, after exacting from him a promise to guarantee the free election of bishops, and to recognize Germany as an elective monarchy. The last clause excluded Rudolph's son from the right of succession. By this act the princes pronounced definitively the decision, which, but a short time before, they had reserved to the Pope.

Henry, after hastily arranging matters in Italy, returned to Germany, and was shortly surrounded by all his former adherents; while Rudolph, on the contrary, was shamefully deserted by the very persons who had been most prominent in having him elected. Gregory maintained an attitude of neutrality toward both competitors for the crown. It was his desire to decide between them in conjunction with the spiritual and temporal princes of Germany, and, as both parties counted on his support, they mutually agreed to guarantee him a safe-conduct coming to and returning from Germany.

---

[1] Vita S. Stanisl., in *Bandtkie*, ed. chronic. *Martini Gall.*, p. 319–380.

But, notwithstanding this profession, there were obvious reasons why each party should dread his presence. Henry kept the passes of the Alps closely guarded, and again commenced to appoint bishops to sees already filled. The consequence was, that many bishoprics had two occupants—the one belonging to the party of Henry, and the other to that of Rudolph. These divisions in the Church still further inflamed the fierce passions evoked by the civil war. Rudolph and his adherents complained bitterly of the apparent indifference of Gregory to their interests; and their complaints might have remained unheeded had not Henry repelled every overture looking to a peaceable accommodation of his difficulties. For this reason the King was precipitately excommunicated by Bernard, the papal legate, at a synod held in Goslar (November, 1077). The legate at the same time confirmed the election of Rudolph. Still, the Pope, on account of the unusually complicated state of affairs in Germany and the fierceness of partisan feeling, proposed that each of the competitors should present their respective claims for adjudication in a synod to be held at Rome in November, 1078. To this, objection was made by Rudolph and his adherents—first, because the case had been already decided by Henry's excommunication; and next, because it was impossible for Rudolph to send embassadors into Italy, as Henry had all the passes of the Alps closely watched. Moreover, both parties accused each other, before the Pope, some time after, of placing obstacles in the way of holding the appointed diet of the kingdom. Gregory then exacted a promise, under oath, from the embassadors of Henry and Rudolph, not to, in any way, prevent the assembling of the proposed diet. In February, 1079, the representatives of the two claimants again appeared in a synod at Rome to advocate the cause of their respective masters.

Gregory made every effort to compromise affairs, but his conciliatory policy greatly irritated Rudolph and his party. They wrote him a letter, in which they expressed the hope that, "if he had been unduly influenced by fear of the man of sin (Henry), or by wicked suggestions from other quarters, he would reconsider his conduct, lest, at the day of judgment, he should be held accountable for the disastrous issue of King Rudolph's cause."

The war in Germany still continued to rage, and was daily becoming more relentless and cruel. Two bloody battles had just been fought in Thuringia. Embassadors were again sent to Rome by both kings. Each party reproached the other with having prevented the holding of the proposed diet, and each demanded that sentence of excommunication should be passed upon its opponent.

Rudolph's representatives charged Henry with having treated the Church with every sort of disrespect, tyrannized over her priests, and banished and imprisoned many of her bishops and archbishops. The recital of these outrages upon the Church and her ministers excited the indignation of the Fathers, and they in consequence called for Henry's immediate excommunication; but Gregory, believing that a peaceable adjustment of the difficulty was still possible, advocated a more conciliatory policy. He again sent a legation into Germany to preside at the long-deferred diet, but Henry and his adherents again managed to hinder its convening, notwithstanding that sentence of excommunication was incurred by the act, and in spite of Henry's uniform and zealous professions of obedience to the commands of the Pope.

The cause of Henry had many advocates, not only throughout all Italy, but even in Rome. Mathilda alone remained steadily loyal in her devotion to the Holy See. In Germany, the misfortunes of the Church and the miseries of the people were deplorable in the extreme. Men whose only qualification was a servile devotion to Henry were forced into the sees of such bishops as had been cast into prison or sent into exile. Cardinal Petrus Igneus, the head of the legation sent into Germany, on his return to Rome, gave a most unfavorable account of Henry's policy and conduct. It now became very evident that the King was playing fast and loose, trifling with Gregory and waiting an opportunity to set him at defiance altogether. Moreover, the bishops of Bremen and Bamberg, his embassadors at Rome, demanded, in the name of their master, shortly after his defeat at the battle of Fladenheim, that the Pope should excommunicate Rudolph, adding that, in case the demand were refused, *Henry would choose another Pope.* On the other hand, the Saxons and Thuringians still complained bitterly of Gregory's hesitancy and want of resolution; while the embassadors of Rudolph spent their eloquence in describing the treachery and tyranny of Henry. Taking things all in all, Gregory felt that he could no longer remain an inactive spectator of events, and that there was now a call upon him to interpose his authority. Accordingly, in a numerously attended synod, held at Rome in 1080, Gregory renewed the *sentence of excommunication and deposition* against Henry, the author of so many and so great evils, absolved his subjects from the obligations of their oath of allegiance, and declared, in unequivocal terms, that Rudolph was the true and only King of the Germans.

Henry and his adherents had recourse to retaliatory measures. Nineteen bishops, assembled at Mentz on the feast of Pentecost, A. D. 1080, declared that they would no longer render allegiance to Gregory. The numerously attended synod of Brixen, under the direction of the perjured cardinal Hugo Blancus, composed of thirty Lombard and German bishops, many of whom had been deposed and were then under sentence of excommunication, and participated in by a large number of nobles, after reading an indictment against Gregory, containing charges at once ludicrous and characteristic of such assemblies, pronounced sentence of deposition upon him, and elected in his stead Guibert, the oft excommunicated Archbishop of Ravenna, and well known as a friend and defender of simonists. Guibert took the name of *Clement III.*

Henry rendered homage to the antipope, promised to place him upon the papal throne in the Vatican, and to accept the imperial crown from his hands. Clement III. now excommunicated King Rudolph, and Guelf, Duke of Bavaria.

After the death of Rudolph, who, though victorious, died from wounds received, as is supposed, at the hands of Godfrey de Bouillon, in the great battle fought on the banks of the Elster (October 15, A. D. 1080), between Naumburg and Zeitz, the Pope entered into an alliance with *Robert Guiscard*, Duke of Normandy. Robert again took the oath of fealty, which he had already given to Nicholas II., and a second time received his investiture from the Holy See.

In the year 1081, the Saxons and Suabians elected *Herman, Count of Salm and a native of Luxemburg*, king in place of Rudolph.

Henry, assured that all Italy was favorable to his cause, marched into that country, and, in the interval between the years 1081 and 1084, frequently laid siege to Rome, the gates of which, contrary to his expectations, had been closed against him by the inhabitants. In his third attempt, in the year 1084, he succeeded in gaining possession of a portion of the city, and the Romans, wearied of the long siege, and irritated at the determined resistance of Gregory, threw open the gates, and received Henry with outward demonstrations of joy. Gregory retired to the castle of St. Angelo, where he remained shut up, and repelled every advance of Henry looking to a reconciliation, until the latter should have made amends for his past conduct. Henry offered to recognize him as lawful Pope, and to surrender Guibert into his hands for punishment, if Gregory would consent to crown him emperor. Gregory replied that he would never absolve Henry, or place the crown upon his head, until he should have made the most ample satisfaction for the insults and outrages he had offered to God and His Church. The Pope added: "Were I willing to turn aside from the path of justice, I might obtain from Henry greater concessions than were ever granted to any of my predecessors. But I have no fear of the threats of wicked men, and am prepared to die, rather than consent to what my conscience can not approve."

All parties now agreed that the decision of the contest should be left to a general council, which Gregory promised to convoke, November, 1083. In his letter of convocation, the Pope stated that it would be made clear by the action of that body who was the real author of the existing evils, and of the antagonism between Church and State. The king, under pretense of leaving the council perfectly free in its deliberations, withdrew all his troops from Rome, with the exception of a slender garrison left in possession of the fort he had built near St. Peter's Church. He also expressed a readiness to furnish safe-conducts to all bishops of his kingdom wishing to attend the council. But these professions, though made under oath, were, as the event proved, wholly insincere. By his orders, the deputies sent as lay representatives by the German princes were put under arrest; bishops and abbots were seized, and cast into prison. Even the papal legate, Otho, Bishop of Ostia, was waylaid, plundered, and imprisoned. In spite of all these drawbacks, the council convened November 20th, its members consisting chiefly of the bishops and abbots from Italy and the south of France.

The assembly sat for only three days. Gregory refused to yield anything, or to come to terms with Henry, till the latter should have made satisfaction to the Church by a new penance. He also passed sentence of excommunication upon all those who were then engaged in preventing, by force or fraud, persons from coming to St. Peter and the Pope.

The people, encouraged by the fearlessness of Gregory, attacked and captured the fort near St. Peter's, and razed it with the ground. These events brought Henry a fourth time to Rome, which, after some efforts, he entered, March 21, 1084. He at once presented Guibert to the people as *his* pontiff; had him consecrated on the following Sunday by the bishops of Modena, Arezzo, and Bologna, and on Easter Sunday received the imperial crown from his hands. Bertha was also crowned under the title of empress.

At length the bishops of both parties, wearied of the ceaseless and bloody conflict, and shocked at the alarming evils it entailed, came together at *Gerstungen* (A. D. 1085), in the hope of adjusting their conflicting claims by the principles of science and authority, instead of by the fortunes of war. The bulk of the people, believing that principles drawn from scientific works were not liable to falsification, or apt to lead men estray,[1] were rejoiced at the prospect of a speedy and just decision of the questions involved.

While Henry was besieging the castle of St. Angelo, *Robert Guiscard* marched on Rome to liberate the Pope. The German king, doubtful of success against so experienced a captain as Robert, and fearing treachery among the Romans, withdrew his forces to Castellana. Robert stormed the city, liberated the Pontiff, and lead him to the Lateran, where, kneeling before him, he made him offerings expressive of his fidelity. In the meantime, the Romans, irritated by the insolence of the Norman soldiery, flew to arms, assembled in the public squares, and threatened to attack the Normans. The latter, furious at this attempt, set fire to portions of the city, and, spreading themselves through its streets, committed every sort of excess. Churches were desecrated and plundered; the virgins of the convents, and Roman matrons and their daughters outraged, and the very fingers of ladies were cut off to secure the rings upon them.

---

[1] *Kunstmann*, the Synod of Gerstungen (Freiburg Theol. Periodical, Vol. IV., p. 116 sq.)

When Robert departed, he took Gregory with him to *Salerno.* Here Gregory held his last synod, in which he renewed the excommunication against Henry, and addressed his last letter to Christendom. This was Gregory's testament to the Church:[1] "*All,*" he says, "*have risen and conspired against us. For this only one reason can be assigned, viz., because We would not keep silence in the face of the perils that threatened the Holy Church, or sanction the action of those who wished to reduce her to a condition of servitude. In every country, even the poorest woman may lawfully accept what man she will for her husband; to the Church alone, the Spouse of God and our Mother, is it forbidden, by the arrogant assumptions of impious men, to remain united to her divine Bridegroom. We could not permit the sons of that Holy Church to have usurpers and adulterers for their fathers, lest they should bear upon them the stain of bastardy.*"

Gregory was shortly after taken ill, and died May 25, A. D. 1085. His last words were: "*I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore do I die in exile.*"[2] These words are at once an admirable commentary on his life, and a proof that, in his last moments, his conduct had the approval of his conscience.[1]

---

[1] This letter is preserved in the chronicle of Verdun, whence it has been taken by *Mansi,* Appendix altera, epp. XV. ad omnes fideles, T. XX., p. 628–630.

[2] Ps. xliv. 8.

Apparently vanquished, Gregory died triumphant. The great principle for which he struggled has been victorious. *Bishops are independent of the secular power, and, as a consequence, the freedom of the Church is secure.* The altar affords an asylum to those pursued by the violence of the throne. Taught by the lessons of Gregory, cities have gained the right of franchise, and in this way laid the foundations of the liberty of mankind. While freely admitting that the plans and actions of Gregory were sometimes extravagant, it is nevertheless true that they were always characterized by a certain elevation and grandeur, which challenge a respectful admiration, if not superior, at least equal, to that elicited by the victories of ancient Rome. To exalt Gregory and speak his praise, is in itself a commendation of the speaker's judgment and good sense, and the surest token that he is on the way to distinction and honor. Hence, *the noblest characters* of Gregory's age, and those most distinguished by eminent intellectual gifts in every age since, have fully appreciated his great worth, and expressed their admiration for him in terms which his life and conduct abundantly deserved.

Gregory was beatified in 1584 by his namesake, Gregory XIII., and placed upon the catalogue of the saints by Benedict XIII., in 1728.[2]

---

[1] *Paul Bernried* (and the generality of chroniclers agree with him, almost word for word), Vita *Greg. VII.*, c. 108: Adstantibus ei episcopis et cardinalibus eumque pro laboribus sanctae conversationis et doctrinae beatificantibus respondit: ego fratres mei dilectissimi nullos labores meos alicujus momenti facio, in hoc solummodo confidens, quod semper dilexi justitiam et odio habui iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio.

[2] Cf. even the most vehement manifesto against Gregory, viz., ep. Theodorici, episc. Virdunens., in *Martène* et *Durand*, Thesaur. novus anecdot., T. I., p. 215. The ecclesiastical office says in praise of him: "Universam ecclesiam mirifice illustravit. — Sicut sol effulsit in ecclesia Dei; — libertati ecclesiae restituendae, extirpandis erroribus et corruptelis tanto studio incubuit, ut ex Apostolorum aetate nullus Pontificum fuisse tradatur qui majores pro ecclesia Dei labores molestiasque pertulerit, aut qui pro ejus libertate acrius pugnaverit. — *Vir vere sanctus, criminum vindex et acerrimus ecclesiae defensor — pluribus in vita et post mortem miraculis clarus.*"

§ 215. *Victor III.* (A. D. 1087)—*Urban II.* (A. D. 1088–1099.)

Victor III. Chron. monast. Cassin. (*Muratori*, Scriptt. rer. Ital., T. IV., p. 151), *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 630. The biographies of *Pandulph. Pisan.* and *Bernard. Guidon.* (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I., p. 351; *Watterich*, T. I., p. 549–571); from and according to the sources, *Ruinart*, in *Mabillon* et *Ruinart*, opp. posthum., Par. 1724, 4to. Cf. especially *Bernoldus Constant.*, in Ussermann, Monumenta rer. Alem., etc., T. II. *Pertz*, T. VII., Pt. II. *Urbani II.* Epist. and Doc., in *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 642 sq. *Harduin*, T. VII., Pt. II., p. 1627 sq. *Watterich*, T. I., p. 571–620.

The influence exercised by Gregory on papal elections previously to his own elevation, was felt in the choice of those who succeeded him. When dying, he designated *Desiderius*, Abbot of Monte Cassino; *Otho*, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia; *Hugo*, Archbishop of Lyons, and *Anselm*, Bishop of Lucca, as persons worthy to be his successors. Of these, Desiderius was chosen, in spite of the efforts made to defeat him by the adherents of Henry and Guibert, who then formed a numerous and influential party at Rome. But it was only after the papal chair had remained *vacant for two years*, that the holy monk, yielding to the earnest prayer of the synod of Capua, and grieved at the deplorable condition of the Church, finally consented to quit his solitude and take upon him the burden of the papacy (May 9, A. D. 1087). Desiderius, as Pope, took the name of Victor III.

The principal event of this short pontificate was the holding of a synod of the bishops of Apulia and Calabria at Benevento, in which the antipope was again excommunicated, and *secular investiture* and traffic in ecclesiastical dignities forbidden under penalty of anathema.

Following the precedent of Gregory, Victor also designated the Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, by birth a Frenchman, as the person who, in his opinion, was most worthy to succeed him. For six months Otho refused to accept; but, at the end of this time, finding resistance useless, he consented, and became Pope under the name of *Urban II.* (March 12, A. D. 1088). Immediately after his accession, Urban addressed a circular letter to the Catholic world, in which he said: "We purpose to tread faithfully in the footsteps of Gregory VII., our predecessor of glorious memory and a martyr to the cause of justice." He was as good as his word. In a letter addressed, a few months later, to Alphonso VI., King of Leon and Castile, he censured him for having taken upon himself to depose the Archbishop of Compostella. "Restore him to his see," wrote Urban, "and then send him here, accompanied by your own deputies, that he may be judged according to the canons. Should you refuse, We shall be obliged to employ harsher measures, such as are by no means agreeable to us." Urban was then (A. D. 1088) holding a synod at Melfi, in Apulia, for the purpose of providing measures for the reformation of the Church. Its decrees were published in the following year at Bari.

In the year 1090, the illustrious St. Bruno, at the request of the Pope, quitted his solitude among the mountains of Grenoble, to assist, by his learning, wisdom, and experience, his former disciple in governing the Church.

After exhorting, through his legates, all the princes of Christendom to unite in defense of the oppressed Church, Urban set out for Rome. But being unable, owing to the power of Henry and the antipope Clement III., in Upper and Central Italy, to make his solemn entrance into the city, he took up his residence on the island in the Tiber, and so destitute was he of resources from legitimate channels, that he was forced to depend on the charity of the faithful for subsistence. *Mathilda* alone remained loyal to the Pope and the Church. Urban hoped to strengthen his power by an alliance which he brought about between this princess and *Guelf* II., the second son of the Duke of Bavaria; but in this he was unsuccessful. Guelf, learning that Mathilda had, for the good of her soul, long since willed her extensive possessions to the Holy See, at once separated from her.[1]

---

[1] The *deed of donation*, after the vita Mathildis a Donizone scripta (in *Baron.* ad a. 1102, nr. 20; *Muratori*, Scriptt., T. V., p. 384): In nomine st. et individuae Trinitatis — ego Mathildis, Dei gratia comitissa, pro remediis animae meae et parentum meorum dedi et obtuli ecclesiae sancti Petri per interventum Domini Gregor. VII. omnia bona mea, jure proprietario, tam quae tunc habueram, quam ea, quae in antea acquisitura eram, sive jure successionis — omnia, sicut dictum est, per manum Domini Greg. VII. Romanae ecclesiae dedi et tradidi, et char-

While religious and civil wars were spreading devastation everywhere in Germany, men of all conditions, sickened with the sight of so much bloodshed, fled from the angry strife of the world and sought quiet and peace of soul in the solitude of the cloister. While devoting their lives and their fortunes to the service of the religious orders, and living according to monastic rule, they still retained their secular dress. Urban II. approved this quasi-religious life as "laudable and worthy of encouragement, and as having its exemplar and sanction in the manner of life of the early Christians."[1]

In order the better to establish the legitimate authority of the papacy in Germany, Urban II. sent thither, as his legates, *Altman*, Bishop of Passau, and *Gebhard*, Bishop of Constance.[2] He further prescribed three degrees of censure, which should be incurred by King Henry and Guibert according to the degree of their guilt, and by those who gave them evil counsel, by simoniacal ecclesiastics, and by all who should influence well-disposed persons against the Church.

Scarcely had reconciliation between Henry and Herman been brought about by the latter's resignation of his pretensions to the crown, than Henry led his armies, for a third time, across the Alps (A. D. 1090), and fought with varying

---

tulam inde fieri rogavi. Sed quia chartula nusquam apparet et timeo, ne donatio et oblatio mea in dubium revocetur: ideo ego, quae supra, Comitissa Mathildis, iterum a praesenti die dono et offero eidem Rom. ecclesiae per manum Bernardi Cardinalis et Legati ejusd. Rom. eccl. sicut in illo tempore dedi per manum Dom. Greg. omnia bona mea, etc. The recently published appendix ad Ph. L. Dionysii opus de Vaticanis cryptis—auctoribus in Rom. Archigymn. professoribus *Sarti* et *Settelenis*, Rom. 1844—proves, by *monumental documents*, the authenticity of this deed of gift.

[1] *Bernold* of Constance illustrates this by what he says of two Suabian monasteries: Eo tempore duo Teutonicorum monasteria cum suis cellulis regularibus disciplinis instituta egregia pollebant, quippe coenobium *St. Blasii* in nigra silva et St. Aurelii, quod *Hirsaugia* dicitur. Ad quae monasteria mirabilis multitudo nobilium et prudentium virorum hac tempestate in brevi confugit, et depositis armis evangelicam perfectionem sub regulari disciplina exsequi proposuit, tanto inquam numero, ut ipsa monasteriorum aedificia necessario ampliarint, eo quod non aliter in eis locum commanendi haberent. Cf. ad a. 1091 (*Ussermann*, T. II., p. 148).

[2] Cf. †*Zell*, Gebhard of Zähringen, Bishop of Constance (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. I., p. 305–404).

fortune against the forces of Mathilda; and Guibert, who but a short time before had been expelled the city by the inhabitants, again gained possession of Rome. But Henry's star was now on the decline, and he soon forfeited whatever of personal respect the people still entertained for him. His eldest son, *Conrad*, a worthy, pious, and generally esteemed prince, who had been crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1087, now deserted the cause of his licentious father, and was crowned King of Italy, at Monza, by Anselm, Archbishop of Milan, lately a partisan of Henry's, but who had now gone over to the party of the Pope.

Henry was shortly after deserted by his second wife, *Praxedes*, a Russian princess. This lady confessed, publicly, at the synods of *Constance* (Holy Week, A. D. 1094) and of *Piacenza* (A. D. 1095), the shameful excesses of her degraded husband and the cruelties to which he subjected her.[1] The latter of these synods, though held in the stronghold of Guibert's party, was attended by four hundred ecclesiastics and thirty thousand laymen, and enacted rigorous decrees against incontinent and simoniacal priests. The *Council of Clermont* (November, A. D. 1095), at which there were present two hundred and eighteen bishops and abbots and a vast multitude of laymen of every rank and condition, protested in the most energetic terms against bishops taking the *homagium*, or oath of fealty, to either king or feudal lord. It was argued that the *homagium was dangerous* to the liberties of the Church, inasmuch as the bishops were placed by it in a condition of *absolute* dependence on the feudal lord, and bound to render him service under all circumstances. If they objected to the performance of these feudal duties from even *religious* motives, their refusal would be regarded as a violation of the homagium, and viewed in the light of a felony. Hence both bishops and priests were forbidden to take the *feudal oath of fidelity* to either king or other layman.[2]

It was the object of the council to sunder relations in every sense prejudicial to the Church, and to establish between bishops and secular princes, instead of the special bond of vassalage which had heretofore subsisted, the general duties and obligations of subjects and rulers. Indeed, this one idea was at the bottom of Pope Gregory's policy. His every act was directed toward this end. To enable the bishops to wrench off the yoke of *feudal servitude*, to regain the liberty of the Church, and to secure the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and the full exercise of ecclesiastical functions, seemed to be the one great mission of his life.

---

[1] *Bernold. Constantiensis* ad an. 1095.

[2] Synod. Clarom., can. 17: Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligium fidelitatis faciat. (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 817; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt.

In the meantime a great movement was in birth among the nations of the West, and one, too, which of its very nature tended to increase the authority and exalt the dignity of the Pope. This movement, being religious in its origin and religious in its aim, called forth the noblest and most disinterested efforts of Christian nations, and bound them together, by the bond of faith, in a great struggle against the enemies of their race and religion. The eyes of all Christendom were instinctively turned to the Pope as the natural leader in such an undertaking, and as the proper person to take the initiative in suggesting and carrying out any general plan of action.

Pope Urban proclaimed the first crusade. All the nations of Europe staked their wealth and their very lives upon its success. The Pope, who had been carrying on a struggle against the violence of kings, a barbarous civilization, and a corrupt clergy solely to achieve the triumph of principle, had all to gain and nothing to lose in this new conflict between civilization and barbarity, between intellectual aspirations and gross sensuality. Hence he was perfectly secure in his authority, even in the very heart of France, when he excommunicated Philip I., who, in the year 1092, had put aside his legitimate wife, Bertha, and was at this time living in adultery with Bertrada, who had also left her lawful husband, the Count of Anjou. *Yves*, the holy *Bishop of Chartres*, who

---

II.) The same thing was said already by Gregory. Cf. *de Marca*, de Concord. Sacerdot., lib. I. Like ordinances were passed in that Council of Clermont, can. 15, 16, 18.

had all along done his best to hold the impetuous passions of the king in check, on one occasion wrote to him in the following energetic language:[1] "The king may deal with me as he sees fit, and may do whatever God permits him to do against me. Whether he cast me into prison or put me beyond the protection of the law, in any event I am determined to endure all things in defense of the law of God, and no consideration will bring me to share the guilt of those from whose chastisement I should shrink."

Urban's journey through Italy and his return to Rome was *now* in every sense a triumph.

It has been claimed that the Pope, desirous of giving some token of grateful recognition of the services rendered by *Roger I.*, Count of Normandy, in freeing Sicily from the Saracen yoke,[2] created him *Perpetual Legate* of the Apostolic See, in that country,[3] by a bull, bearing the date of 1098. Notwithstanding that the authenticity of this bull has been questioned by a number of authors, those who ruled over Sicily toward the close of the Middle Ages, and particularly after the time of Ferdinand I., the Catholic, persistently claimed the privileges which were supposed to be attached to that office. These were so extensive and abnormal, that they placed in the hands of the sovereign of the country, not only plenary jurisdiction in the administration of purely spiritual matters, but powers so ample as to supersede the primatial authority of the Pope himself. This assumed power went on increasing, and trenching on the spiritual domain, till it became so completely independent in its workings, that in the sixteenth century the title "*Monarchia Siciliae Ecclesiastica*" was introduced to adequately express its scope. At length Pope *Clement XI.*, by a bull, dated February 20, 1714, and beginning "*Romanus Pontifex*," protested against the assumption of this extravagant and much abused legatine power, declared the tribunal abolished, and ordered that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the country should be regulated by the ordinances of the Council of Trent. During the reigns of *Philip V.* of Spain and the Emperor *Charles VI.*, to whom Sicily had reverted, this decisive action gave rise to so violent a contest, that *Benedict XIII.* thought it better to yield a little, and by the bull "*Fidei*," of August 30, 1728, permitted that the so-called "*Judge of the Monarchy*" should enjoy a definite and limited jurisdiction, and that the sovereign of the country should for the present have the right of appointing this officer.

But, even according to this arrangement, it was assumed that the judge delegate enjoyed his jurisdiction, not by papal concession, but in virtue of the pretended legatine power, abolished by Clement XI., and of certain political ordinances. The repeated efforts of subsequent pontiffs to induce the civil authority to accept a code of legislation which would regulate ecclesiastical jurisdiction on the basis of the Church's constitution, remained wholly unsuccessful amid the varying changes of the ruling dynasty. It made little difference in this respect whether Francis II., Garibaldi, or King Victor Emmanuel ruled the island—each, in his turn, stubbornly maintained that the legates nominated by him should, no matter how extravagant and unwarranted their assumptions, be recognized as papal legates.

---

[1] Ivo Carnotens, epp. 15 and 20.

[2] See p. 328.

[3] Cf. *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 659. *Gaufred. Malaterra*, in his Hist. Sicula, Panormi, 1723, lib. IV., c. 29 (*Murat.*, T. V., p. 601 sq.) Cf. the exhaustive Monograph, by †⁎*Sentis*, "Monarchia Sicula," being a historico-canonical inquiry, together with the respective documents, Freiburg, 1869.

But when the "*Judge of the Sicilian Monarchy*" arrogantly assumed in the spiritual order powers as much beyond his legitimate authority as those violently seized by the new King of Italy in the temporal, thereby rendering the administration of ecclesiastical affairs impossible, Pope Pius IX. resolved to make short work of both the so-called Apostolic Legation, or Sicilian Monarchy, and the refractory Legate, or Judge of the Monarchy, which he did, by excommunicating the latter and abolishing the former, in a bull, dated January 28, 1864, and published October 10, 1867.

§ 216. *The Crusades.*

Willelm. Tyrius († after 1188), Hist. belli sacri, lib. XXIII. (*Bongars.*, T. I.); Germ. transl. by *Kausler*, Stuttg. 1843. Anonymi belli sacri Historia, in *Mabillon*, Museum, T. I., Pt. II., p 130; epitomized in *Jac. Bongars*, Gesta Dei per Francos, etc., Hann. 1611, 2 T., f. *Michaud*, Bibl. des Croisades, Par. 1830, 4 T. *Wilken*, Hist. of the Crusades, according to Eastern and Western documents, 1807–1832, 7 vols. *Michaud*, Hist. des Croisades (Paris, 1811–1822), 5 vols., 4th ed.; Paris, 1825 sq., 7 vols.; new ed., 1854, 4 vols., 8vo; Paris, 1854, Engl. transl., by *W. Robson*, 3 vols., London, 1852 (Tr.); Germ. transl., by *Ungewitter*, Quedlinburg, 1828 sq., 7 vols.; *von Sybel*, Hist. of the Crusades, Dusseldorf, 1841. *Sporschil*, Hist. of the Crusades, Lps. 1843. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. I., p. 37–231. *Ludwig*, Manual of Univ. Hist., Vol. II., p. 107–141. *Kampschulte*, Character and Progress of the Crusades (Austr. Quart. of Cath. Theol., Year the Second, 1863, p. 193–212). *Ratisbonne*, Vie de Saint Bernard.

The Crusades were the second general movement in the history of the Germanic nations of Europe. These were now brought together, for the *first time*, by religious motives, to make a combined effort to achieve a distinctively Christian triumph. The Crusades, with their numerous influences for good and their many evil consequences, perfectly characterize this period of the world's history, and on that account deserve particular attention.

They are a marvelous instance of *the influence exercised by the Church over the German people, even in the midst of the most trying circumstances.* She had succeeded in inspiring men of every rank and walk of life with a truly Christian spirit. She had taught them to set a higher value on the unseen blessing of Heaven than on the fleeting possessions of earth, and, in the performance of their duty, to act from the dictates of an upright conscience, and not by compulsion or restraint. And so faithful were they to her lessons, and so enthusiastic in carrying out her teachings, that at her bidding princes and people, seizing arms, rushed as one man to the conquest of that land hallowed by the presence of our Savior and the consummation of the work of Redemption. Viewed in this light, the Crusades constitute one of *the most glorious triumphs of Christianity.* The descendants of those barbarous nations who, but a few short centuries before, deserted the frozen and desolate regions of the North in search of more genial and fruitful climes, now go forth to fresh conquests. But how different their motive and the spirit that animates them from the influence which guided their ancestors! Now they give up everything; their goods, their lands, their possessions, their home and country—in short, all that man prizes and holds dear on earth, and endure all manner of privations, toil, and suffering; and this in order to insure the realization and triumph of a great Christian idea.

The same divine spirit which, in the course of the migration of nations, inspired princes to enter the Church and to induce their subjects to follow their example, for the security of the throne, on the one hand, and of public order on the other, now enters into the hearts of the people themselves, and they, recognizing the voice of God in that of His Church, are docile to her exhortations, and, following the lead of their princes, arm for the common cause.[1]

A long series of events, reaching back through centuries, and closely related to each other, combined to prepare the minds of men for this splendid contest, in which the holy enthusiasm of the Christians came face to face with the religious fanaticism of the Saracens. In every age since the day when the redemption of man was consummated on Calvary, ceaseless streams of pilgrims have gone up to Jerusalem.[1] The example of *Helena*, the mother of Constantine the Great, did much to encourage the practice. No shrine in the Catholic world has been so numerously frequented by pilgrims as the Church built upon the site of the Holy Sepulchre. In the tenth century vast multitudes of Christians set out to the Holy Land in anticipation of the approaching end of the world; and multitudes not less numerous, animated by the spirit of piety, and anxious to escape for a time the disorders which the contest on investitures had given rise to in both Church and State, went thither in the century following.

---

[1] Cf. *Willelm. Tyrius,* Hist. belli sacri, lib. I. (*Bongars.,* T. I., p. 640.)

As early as the year 999, *Sylvester II.* had already made a call upon Christendom[2] in the name of suffering Jerusalem; and in 1074, *Gregory VII.*, on learning the trials and hardships to which pilgrims journeying to the Holy Land were subjected—beholding himself, as it were, in spirit, at the head of an army marching to deliver the Holy Sepulchre—wrote as follows:[3] "As our fathers have time and again journeyed to that sacred land, to strengthen, by their example, the faith of Christians, so shall we also, sustained by the prayers of Christendom and under the guidance of Christ, who will open to us the way—for it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps, but the ordering of his way is of the Lord—go thither, for the sake of the same faith, and to defend our Christian brothers."

The grievances, the hardships, and the fears of the Emperor *Alexius*, and his prayers for aid, were laid before the council of Piacenza, in the year 1095, by his embassadors. But the representations and the appeals of the Greeks were cold and spiritless, compared with the fiery enthusiasm, the calm confidence, and the inspiring eloquence of *Peter the Hermit.*[1] Persuaded that he had a call from Heaven to avenge the insults heaped upon Christians and the Christian faith by the Saracens, he went through the West, describing, with the terrible energy of his sweeping eloquence, the sufferings of his brethren in the Holy Land and the profanation of holy places and holy things, and calling upon Europe to rise and go forth to deliver the Holy Sepulchre. Peter the Hermit and Pope *Urban II.* met at the council of Clermont. The Pope, moved to tears by the recital of Peter, made a stirring and eloquent appeal to the assembled multitude.[2] "That land," said he, "in which the light of truth first shone; where the Son of God, in human guise, deigned to walk as man among men; where the Lord taught and suffered, died, and rose again; where the work of man's redemption was consummated—this land, consecrated by so many holy memories, has passed into the hands of the impious. The temple of God has been profaned, His saints slain, and their bodies cast out upon the plains for the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field to feed upon. The blood of Christians flows like water in and about Jerusalem, and there is none to do the poor service of giving burial to their remains. Strong in our trust in the Divine Mercy, and by virtue of the authority of SS. Peter and Paul, of whose fullness we are the depositary, we hereby grant full remission of any *canonical penalties*[3] whatever to all the faithful of Christ who *from motives of earnest and sincere*

---

[1] See p. 311.

[2] †*Junkmann*, de Expeditionibus et peregrinationibus sacris ante synodum Claromontanam, Vratisl. 1859. The *same* author has announced "Supplements to the Hist. of the Crusades."

[3] *Gregor.* epp., lib. II., ep. 31. A second letter, concerning the same affair, ad omnes Christianos, lib. I., ep. 49, and a third one to the Count of Burgundy, lib. I., ep. 46. Concerning Victor III. (1086), it is said in the Chronic. Casin., lib. III., c. 71: De omnibus fere Italiae populis Christianor. exercitum congregans atque vexillum b. Petri Apost. illis contradens, sub remissione omnium peccatorum contra Saracenos in Africa commorantes direxit.

---

[1] His influence in preparing the masses for undertaking the first crusade, however, is asserted only by *later* authorities.

[2] The discourse in *Willelm. Tyr.*, Hist. belli sacri, lib. I., c. 14 (*Bongars.*, T. I. p. 640). Another recension of this discourse in *Baron.* ad an. 1095, nros. 35 sq. See *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 205 sq.

[3] Can. 2: Quicunque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniae adeptione ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni poenitentia reputetur. (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 816; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1718.) In *Urban's* discourse, given in *Willelm. Tyr.*, it is said besides: Nos autem de misericordia Domini et beat. Petri et Pauli apostolorum auctoritate confisi, fidelibus Christianis, qui contra eos arma susceperint, et onus sibi hujus peregrinationis assumserint, injunctas sibi pro suis delictis poenitentias relaxamus. Qui autem ibi in vera poenitentia decesserint, et peccatorum indulgentiam et fructum aeternae mercedis se non dubitent habituros. (*Bongars.*, T. I., p. 640.)

devotion shall take up arms against the infidel. Should any one die while engaged in this holy pilgrimage, let him be assured that, *if he be truly penitent, he shall have his sins fully remitted to him*, and pass to the joys of life eternal."

At the close of Urban's address, the multitude rose to their feet, and in one voice cried out: "*It is the will of God! It is the will of God.*"

The Pope then showing them the sign of their redemption, said: "Wear it upon your shoulders and upon your breasts; let it shine upon your arms and upon your standards; it will be to you the surety of victory or the palm of martyrdom; it will unceasingly remind you that Christ died for you, and that it is your duty to die for him."

Many immediately marked their right shoulders with the sign of the *Cross*,[1] which became, from that hour, the special distinction of those engaged in the expedition, and indicated that those who bore it were ready to become soldiers of Christ, to take up their cross and follow Him. This sign, constantly before the eyes of the Crusaders, reminded them that the sentiments and aspirations of each should be the sentiments and aspirations of all; that in this holy warfare feelings of enmity should be put aside; and that, under *the lead of the gallant knights*, they should march as friends and brothers to the deliverance of the Holy Land. As Christ was the Great Leader of all, each knight sang with joyous enthusiasm the triumphant strains of the anthem: "*Media vita in morte sumus;*" "*Quem quaerimus adjutorem nisi Te Domine,*" *etc.*, "*Kyrie eleison.*"[2]

Such was the great idea, such the inspiring motives of the Crusades. It is, of course, not pretended that human passion and worldly ambition may not have had a share in the motives of some; but when this is conceded, it must, on the other hand, be admitted that nothing short of a heavenly influence could have sustained and energized the nations of Europe in the conduct of this war during the lapse of two centuries. "Never since the creation of the world," says the monk Robert, "never since the consummation of the mystery of the Cross, has any expedition at all comparable to this been set on foot; and for this reason, because it was the work of God and not of man."

---

[1] Cf. the account of the eye-witness, *Balderici*, Hist. Jerosolymitana (*Bongars.*, T. I., p. 83).

[2] See above, p. 421.

These popular expeditions were as profitable to the faith as they were creditable to the honor of Christians. They rebuked the rising rationalism of that age, and proclaimed the victory of faith. As, in the early days of the Church, *the foolishness of the Cross* was the confusion of the wisdom of Paganism, so now the same faith triumphed over *Christian rationalism.*

The warlike but undisciplined host that set out in the first expedition for the Holy Land, under the leadership of Peter the Hermit, had melted to half their original number before they reached Bulgaria, where the Turks completely annihilated the remainder. A second army of gallant knights, also under the lead of Peter the Hermit, but superior in organization and discipline to the first, crossed over to Constantinople and Antioch, and, after having endured countless hardships and faced dangers the most appalling, finally triumphed over the Saracens and took Jerusalem, July 15, A. D. 1099. They proclaimed *Godfrey de Bouillon* its first king; but the pious Christian hero, refusing to wear the crown of royalty where the Son of God had worn a crown of thorns, styled himself simply Protector of the Holy Sepulchre. The patriarchate of Jerusalem was again restored. *Baldwin*, the brother of Godfrey, remained in the county of *Edessa*, established in 1098, to defend Jerusalem from the East, while *Bohemund*, the prudent prince of Tarentum, was stationed at Antioch.

The dissensions of the Crusaders prevented the capture of the strong garrison of *Ascalon*, which, had it been taken, would have formed a most important defense on the side of Egypt.

Urban II., who had been chiefly instrumental in setting this crusade on foot and insuring its success, did not live to hear of the triumph of the Christian arms and the capture of Jerusalem. Before the tidings of their successes reached the West he had passed to his reward, July 29, A. D. 1099.

§ 217. *Paschal II.* (A. D. 1099–1118)—*Gelasius II.* (A. D. 1119)—*Calixtus II.* (A. D. 1119–1124.)

Paschal. Vita et Epp. (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 977 sq.; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1763 sq.) *Udalrici* Cod. Epistol., in *Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I. *Gelasii* et *Calixti II.* Vita et Epp. (*Mansi*, T. XXI., in *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1941 sq.) *Watterich*, T. II., p. 1–153 (from Paschal II. to Calixtus II.) *Gervais*, Political Hist. of Germ. under Henry V., Lps. 1841. *Giesebrecht*, l. c., Vol. III., Pt. 3.

While the people of the Western world were pushing on to the East, and seemed wholly taken up with the prosecution of the enterprise, the contest on investitures went on all the same. The discussion was no longer confined to the transference of the *symbols* used in the ceremony of investiture. It was now chiefly devoted to securing *the freedom of canonical elections*, which were impossible under the system of lay investiture; to the abrogation of the *homagium*, or oath made by ecclesiastics to their feudal lords; and, finally, to removing the disgraceful vice of *simony*, which was essentially connected with the practice of lay investiture.

After the death of the antipope, Clement III. (A. D. 1100), his partisans continued to appoint successors to him. There were three of them within a short interval. Cardinal *Rainer*, formerly a monk of Clugny, but drawn from his retirement by Gregory VII., who saw in him the promise of distinction, was elected successor to Urban, but made a long resistance before he could be prevailed upon to accept the office. He took the name of *Paschal II.*

The new Pope pursued the same policy as Gregory VII., and was equally as energetic as his illustrious predecessor, but did not possess the same firmness of character or knowledge of the world. He was accustomed to say, that "when one wished to raise a fallen man, he should do so by reaching down for him as far as he could safely, without falling himself."

In a Lateran synod of the year 1101, he again renewed, in the most emphatic language, the prohibition of *lay investi-*

ture;[1] but in his relations to *Philip*, king *of France*, who had already been twice excommunicated for his licentious excesses, and whom, on his sworn promise to give up his connection with Bertrada, Paschal had freed from ecclesiastical censure (A. D. 1104), were not characterized by a similar display of energy. Philip disregarded his oath, and the Pope allowed the perjury to pass without rebuke.

Anselm of Canterbury was at this time also engaged in a violent contest, in the Pope's name, against *Henry I.*, king of England, the object of which was to secure the canonical freedom of episcopal elections, and to abolish the practice of lay investiture, by the transference of the ring and crosier. The king granted *freedom of election* in the case of bishops and abbots, and gave up all claim to investiture; *but* required, contrary to the prohibition of Urban,[2] that bishops and abbots-elect should take the usual *oath of fidelity to the king previously to their consecration.*[2] This brought the controversy to a close for the time being.

The censures of the Church against Henry IV. had been again renewed. After the death of his son, *Conrad*, in battle (A. D. 1101), Henry had the mortification of seeing his younger son, Henry V., whom he had but a short time before appointed his successor, rise in arms against him (1104). Pope Paschal, being assured by an embassy from the young king that their master was earnestly desirous of a reconciliation, and ready to give every assurance and pledge of his future obedience to the Church, commissioned Gebhard, Bishop of Constance, to free him from the ecclesiastical censures incurred by his participation in schism, and to crown him king of Germany (A. D. 1106).

Henry IV., after many fruitless efforts to maintain himself, was finally obliged, at the diet of Ingelheim, to resign his kingdom in favor of his son. He managed to make his escape from confinement, and, finding a numerous and powerful following along the Rhine and in Belgium, was again about to fan into a fresh flame the smoldering embers of civil war, when he died suddenly, at Liége, in August, 1106, without having effected his reconciliation to the Church.

---

[1] *Conc. Rom.* a. 1101, in *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 1135; the same repeated at the Synod. Guastalens. (1106), Trecens. (1107), Benevent. (1108), Lateran. (1110). Cf. *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 1209–1231; T. XXI., p. 7.

[2] Cf. on this quarrel, *Möhler*, Anselm of Canterbury (Complete Works, T. I., p. 97–121); *Hasse*, Anselm of Canterbury, Lps. 1843, Pt. I., p. 293–454; *Remusat*, Anselm de Cantorbery, Paris, 1854. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Counc., Vol. V., p. 248 sq.

Such was the death of the unworthy son of the great Henry III., after a reign of half a century, during which time, according to the testimony of his contemporaries, he wasted his splendid natural gifts in bringing about his own ruin, desolating his kingdom, impoverishing his subjects, and in carrying on a vain and disastrous struggle against the Church of God.[1]

The conduct of Henry V. was anything but straightforward and honest. He continued uninterruptedly to invest bishops and abbots by staff and ring, and to violate the decrees of councils on many other counts. The embassadors of Henry had invited Paschal to come into Germany, and adjust ecclesiastical matters; but the Pope prudently declined, and, instead, made a journey to France, where he called upon Philip and his son to lend their aid against Henry and the enemies of the Church. The embassadors of Henry came up with the Pope at Châlons, and demanded that he should restore the practice of lay investiture. Paschal replied, through the bishop of Piacenza, that "the Church, which had been redeemed and made free through the blood of Christ, should not be reduced to the condition of a servant; but that if her bishops were *to depend for their appointment on the pleasure of the king*, to be invested by him with *the symbols of their spiritual authority*, and to be forced (in taking the *homagium*) to place their consecrated hands within the blood-stained hands of a layman, then indeed would she be in a condition of unseemly and degrading servitude." The embassadors took their leave of the Pope with the significant remark, that the sword would decide the contest in Rome. Henry was daily growing more aggressive. He not only invested bishops, but now proclaimed his purpose of appointing them also. He sent a message to this effect to Paschal, who was then engaged in enacting decrees, at the synod of Troyes (A. D. 1107), relative to the freedom of ecclesiastical elections. The Pope then summoned Henry to appear at Rome within a twelvemonth, and submit the whole matter to the decision of an ecumenical council.

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Chᵗ. H., Vol. III., p. 334. (Tr.) Cf. *Du Chesne*, T. IV., p. 289. *Bouquet*, T. XII., p. 20.

Henry, accompanied by a number of learned men, and at the head of a powerful army, crossed the Alps, in 1110, with the intention of deciding the contest by an appeal to arms. King Henry sent a deputation to Sutri, where the Pope, who was by no means skilled in the art of diplomacy, yielding to his threats, and more or less influenced by his early monastic education, signed a treaty which he thought would help him out of his difficulties, but which he shortly learned complicated matters more than ever. The plenipotentiaries of King Henry and Pope Paschal met at Sutri in 1111, and agreed to the following articles of a treaty:[1] *The king*, on his part, *should relinquish the right of investiture*, leave the Church in the possession and enjoyment of all goods not held by feudal tenure, and of all offerings made by the faithful, and should declare the oaths which he had obliged his subjects to take against the bishops not binding. *The Pope*, on his part, *agreed to surrender to the king all fiefs belonging to the empire;* to command the bishops to resign to the king such fiefs as had belonged to the empire at any time since the reign of Charles the Bald, and to forbid the bishops, under penalty of excommunication, from *assuming the rights of the empire, or from taking possession of cities, countships, or such other dignities as had attached to them regal rights and prerogatives.*

---

[1] Henry's account of the transaction in the ep. ad Parmenses, in Udalrici Cod. epp., nro. 261, with the documents, nros. 262, 263, which must be filled up from the Vita Paschalis II., by Card. Aragon. (*Muratori*, Scriptor., T. III., Pt. I., p. 360), and *Baron.* ad an. 1111, nro. 2 sq. Complete account in the Chron. Casin., lib. IV., c. 35 sq. (*Pertz*, T. IX., p. 778); more abridged in the *Annalista Saxo* ad an. 1111 (*Eccard.*, T. I., p. 626). This strange idea of Paschal had, however, already occupied many minds. Urban II., at the council of Melfi, in the year 1090, in the 11th can., demanded: "Ne gravamen aliquod sancta patiatur ecclesia, nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus. Unde cavendum est, ne servilis conditionis aut curialium officiorum obnoxii ab episcopis promoveantur in clerum. — Quod si forte clericorum aliquis cujuslibet laici possessionibus usus fuerit, aut vicarium qui debitum reddet inveniat, aut *possessione careat, ne gravamen ecclesiae inferatur*." (*Mansi*, T. XX., p. 723; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1686.) *Paschal.* ep. 22 ad Henr. V. imperat. (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1790; *Mansi*, T. XX., p. 1007): "Ministri vero altaris ministri curiae facti sunt, etc. — Oportet enim episcopos curis saecularibus expeditos curam suorum agere populorum, nec ecclesiis suis abesse diutius."

Paschal had been trained according to the severe discipline of Clugny, and believed that it was far preferable to have the clergy poor and in the enjoyment of their liberty than enslaved and abounding in wealth; and, as he said in his letter to the king, he had rather have his priests serve the *altar* than the *curia.*

The king, who well knew that no such sudden and complete separation of things spiritual and things temporal was possible in the then existing state of affairs in Germany, and that, if it were even practicable, the German prelates would not consent to it, agreed to accept the articles of the treaty, on condition that they should be ratified by the bishops. Accordingly, when the Pope and King Henry met at Rome, later on in the same year, and published the articles of the treaty, the German bishops refused to give up the regalia, or rights and prerogatives held of the crown; and there were many who asserted that an instrument which would deprive the Church of what belonged to her by centuries of actual possession was nothing short of *sacrilegious* in its character. The Pope, deterred by such opposition, declined to carry out the articles of the treaty, and at the same time refused to withdraw his prohibition of lay investiture. On the other hand, Henry, while refusing to give up the right of investiture, claimed that, as the Pope had refused to carry out his part of the treaty, there was no reason why he himself should be refused imperial coronation; and, growing irritated at the determined opposition made by Paschal to his pretensions, threw him and a number of his cardinals into prison. Here King Henry plied the Pope with all manner of promises and threats, in the hope of bringing him to accede to his wishes. For a long time Paschal resisted every appeal, repulsed every threat; but fearing that, if he held out longer, a fresh schism might be the consequence, and wishing to alleviate the sufferings of the Romans and to secure the liberty of a number of laymen and ecclesiastics imprisoned by order of the king, after giving utterance to the following protest, "Cogor pro ecclesiae liberatione," signed a treaty (A. D. 1111), by which Henry was to enjoy the right of investing, by ring and *crosier*, before consecration, all bishops who had been freely elected, and of deciding between claimants in contested elections. It was further stipulated that any whom the Emperor would refuse to invest should not be consecrated.[1] The Pope also promised, on oath, never to avenge on King Henry, or on any of his subjects, the outrages to which he and his cardinals had been subjected, and never to interfere with either the king, or any one else in his kingdom, on account of the practice of investiture.

The Pope, after having accepted these conditions, placed the imperial crown upon the head of Henry. The current of public opinion now turned against the Emperor. He was regarded as a tyrant, and the papal grant, or "*Privilegium*," was condemned in unqualified terms as having been extorted from the Vicar of Christ by laying violent hands on his august person.

The conduct of the Pope on this occasion was the subject of much controversy among men of different views—some censuring it severely, and others excusing it in part; but all condemning the practice of lay investiture, as subversive of the vital interests of the Church, and destructive of the *freedom of canonical elections*. *Gerhoh*, the distinguished provost of Reichersberg,[2] was among the ablest and most energetic advocates of the freedom of ecclesiastical elections. This was precisely the point on which Henry IV. and Henry V. had most strenuously insisted, well aware that if they could succeed in destroying the freedom of canonical elections, they might set over bishoprics and monasteries persons *entirely devoted* to the interests of the crown. Moreover, royal sycophants and servile courtiers flattered them with the preposterous notion, that, *in virtue of a spiritual power which they received when anointed kings*, they might dispose, according to their pleasure, of the bishoprics and monasteries within their realm. Others again appealed to the "*Privilegium*," which, it was pretended, *Pope Hadrian had granted to Charlemagne and his successors, investing them with power to appoint to bishoprics within the Frankish Empire;*[1] and cited instances, in which the appointments made by secular princes in times past had been tolerated. Still others held, that as the churches of the kingdom were the property of the king, and as he and his predecessors had *made them* what they were, they were unquestionably at his service, should be governed only by such persons as he should set over them, and consequently that he was perfectly free to dispose of them to whom he would. Such were the representations made by Adelbert of Bremen and servile courtiers to young King Henry.

---

[1] Chronic. Casin., lib. IV., c. 40. The acts in Udalrici Cod. epp., nr. 264, 265, and in Vita Paschalis, by Cardin. Aragon. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I., p. 362.) Extracts in *Baron.* ad a. 1111, nr. 18 sq.

[2] *Gerhohus* de statu ecclesiae, c. 22: "Spretis electionibus is apud eum dignior caeteris episcopatus honore habitus est, qui ei vel familiarior exstitisset, vel plus obsequii aut pecuniae obtulisset." The same author remarks on the freedom of ecclesiastical elections: "Haec sunt *pia de spiritu pietatis provenientia spectacula*, cujus operationi et hoc assignamus, quod in diebus istis magna est libertas canonicis electionibus episcoporum, abbatum, etc., provehendorum in dignitatibus, quas per multos annos paene a temporibus Ottonis I. imperatoris usque ad imperatorem Henricum IV. vendere solebant ipsi reges vel imperatores regnante ubique Simonia." (Expos. in Ps. xxxix.) Cf. **Bach*, Gerhoh I., Provost of Reichersberg, a German Reformer of the twelfth century (Austr. Quart. of Cath. Theol., Year IV., 1865, n. 1), and *Ratisbonne*, Life of St. Bernard (Germ. transl., p. LX.)

Gregory and the Church party, *on the other hand*, rejected the claim of lay investiture, basing their action on a canon of the *Eighth Ecumenical Council*,[2] which positively forbade all interference of the secular power in episcopal appointments, or any attempt whatever to impede the fullest freedom in canonical elections. They insisted that *this had always been the rule and practice of the Church*, and that unless it could be again restored, it would be impossible to eradicate the detestable vice of simony.[3] The advocates of the Church further remarked, that in the ceremony of investiture no distinction was made between the secular grant and spiritual jurisdiction. The formula did not run, "*Receive the lands belonging to this Church*," but "*Receive this Church*." The temporalities, therefore, as had already been pointed out by St. Peter Damian, could not be separated from the grant of spiritual jurisdiction. The two were necessarily connected, and should be conferred by the same person or authority. Moreover, the *crosier* and *ring*, which were the symbols used in the ceremony of investiture, were the recognized symbols of jurisdiction in the *spiritual* ministry and of pastoral authority. Hence, *as the spiritual and temporal in the Church stand related to each other as soul and body in man, to separate them, or rend them asunder, is impossible, without destroying the constituent body of which they are the components.*

Again, lay investiture, as then practiced, was subversive both of freedom of canonical elections and of the undoubted rights of the Church. The bishop could not come into possession of the goods of the Church, except through appointment by a secular prince; and in appointing him, the prince conveyed to another that over which he had no manner of right. Such an act could be justified only on the supposition that the secular prince enjoyed a vested right over the goods of the Church; but as *they had been devoted irrevocably and forever to the Church as such*, and not to the king, or personally to successive bishops, it was plain he had no possible claim to dispose of them. He might dispose of revocable feudal rights, but not of Church property.

---

[1] See above, p. 305.

[2] *Conc. Constantinop.* IV., can. 12: Perlatum est ad nos, non posse sine principum praesentia concilium agi. Atqui nusquam sacri canones sanciunt, ut ad synodos saeculares principes cogantur, sed soli duntaxat episcopi. Quare nec alias reperimus eos aliis, nisi oecumenicis conciliis, interfuisse. *Neque enim fas est, ut saeculares principes rerum, quae Dei sacerdotibus contingunt, spectatores fiant.* (*Harduin*, T. V., p. 1103.)

[3] *Döllinger*, Ch. H., p. 158–165; *Cox's* transl., Vol. III., p. 318–345. *Neander*, Ch. H., Vol. V., Pt. I., p. 170–183; *Torrey's* transl., Vol. IV., p. 132–143. (Tr.)

This consisted of donations and allodial inheritances, and it required nothing short of an act of usurpation to subject it to the ordinary conditions of investiture. It was admitted that princes should have a voice in the appointment of bishops, but *as sons, and not as superiors of the Church*. On the other hand, bishops and abbots should render obedience to princes, and be subject to them *in matters of civil allegiance in so far as such were lawful*, and in the same sense as others, not in a condition of vassalage, were subject to them.

The conduct of Pope Paschal was severely reprehended; and *Godfrey*, the zealous abbot *of Vendôme*, in commenting upon it, contrasted it with the heroic resolution of the martyrs of old, and particularly with the example of SS. Peter and Paul, the founders of the Roman Church.

"If," said Godfrey, in a letter to Paschal, "if the successor of the Apostles has disregarded their example, he should hasten, if he would not forfeit their glorious crown, to undo and repair what he has done, and, like a second Peter, expiate his fault with tears of repentance." Lay investiture, he added, whereby power was granted to laymen to convey possessions, and therewith a grant of jurisdiction in spiritual matters, was equivalent to a denial of faith, destructive of the liberty of the Church, and an out-and-out *heresy*. He stated plainly to Paschal, that whereas a vicious Pope might be borne with, any one loyal to his faith had a duty to openly protest against one stained with the guilt of heresy.

Hildebert, Bishop of Mans (Cenomanensis), and *Yves*, Bishop of *Chartres* (Carnotensis), although strenuous advocates of the principles of Gregory VII. and Urban II., and regarding lay investiture as entirely indefensible, judged more moderately of the conduct of Paschal. "The Pope," said the former, "has exposed his life in the cause of the Church, and his yielding was only for a moment, to put an end to the shedding of blood and other miseries." The latter, in a letter to *John*, Archbishop *of Lyons*, excused the Pope, by saying that "God had permitted the holiest of men . . . to give way to such weaknesses, that they might in this way gain a more intimate knowledge of their own hearts, learn to ascribe their faults to themselves, and be brought to humbly acknowledge that whatever of good was in them was entirely due to the grace of God." He said that while he opposed lay investiture, he could not accept the extreme views of those who went the length of calling it a heresy. "For," said he, "heresy has reference to faith, and faith has its seat within; but investiture is something external. . . . Should one claim, in connection with investiture, the power of conferring a sacrament, or a *rem sacramenti*, such one would be a heretic, not by reason of the investiture itself, but of the implied usurpation." To which Archbishop John replied that, "Heresies have indeed their seat in the heart; but since works are the witnesses of a believer's faith, so are they also of a heretic's; . . . and, although the outward act of investiture is of itself not heretical, still one who maintains and defends it necessarily bases his argument on *heretical principles.*"

But perhaps no writer of that age has set forth the views of the two parties with greater clearness, accuracy, and fairness, than *Placidus*, *Prior of Nonantula*, in a work which he wrote in defense of the Church. To those who objected that the Church was essentially spiritual in its constitution, and, as such, could lay claim to no earthly possessions, he replied: "The Church is indeed a spiritual society, a community of believers, adorned with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. But her consecrated earthly gifts should also contribute to her honor; and to wrest from her what has once been given to her, is sacrilegious. And as the heart, while adoring God in spirit and in truth, requires some outward expression of this act of adoration, it is a necessity to erect visible temples to His honor. . . . As the soul can not subsist in the present life without the body, so neither can the spiritual without the corporeal. The latter is sanctified by its connection with the former. If the Church is possessed of abundance to-day, it belongs to her by the same title as her comparative poverty in times past. She has the same title to both—their consecration to God. The same Supreme Being, who of old constituted her in poverty, bestowed wealth at a later day as a means of adding to her earthly glory. . . . Princes should by no means be denied a voice in episcopal elections, but they should speak as members of the community; as *sons*, not as lords of the Church. . . . The emperor is anointed, not to rule the *Church*, but to faithfully govern the *empire.*"

And concerning the treaty entered into by the Pope and the Emperor, he says: "The Pope is not bound by the compact. . . . An oath requiring one to do a wicked thing, is not binding. On the contrary, whosoever has laid himself under such obligations, should do penance for having taken the name of God in vain, inasmuch as he may not do what he has promised, even if he had never taken an oath."

As there were many bishops in Italy and France who condemned the *Privilegium*, as the treaty between Pope Paschal and Henry was called, maintaining that it compromised the rights of the Church, the Pope, in order to escape the complications in which he was involved resigned the papacy and retired to the island of Ponza, near Terracina, but was again persuaded, by the prayers of the cardinals and the Roman people, to resume his office and submit his case to the decision of a council to be held at the Lateran (A. D. 1112). The Pope here put aside the insignia of the pontificate, but, at the request of the fathers, consented to again receive them. He then stated the circumstances of his difficulty—how owing to his oath, he could not proceed against the Emperor[1]—

---

[1] Cf. Annalista Saxo ad a. 1112; from this source, extracts in Chronic. Ursperg. and Vita Paschal. ex Cardin. Aragon. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I., p. 363.) Accord

but went on to say that, his sanction of lay investiture being illegal, he would retract what he had done. As he had been suspected of heresy, he next read a profession of faith, and declared that he accepted, without qualification, the decrees of his predecessors, Gregory and Urban. The council then examined the *Privilegium*, and pronounced it to be contrary to ecclesiastical and divine law, but, out of regard for the Pope's oath, abstained from passing any censure on Henry.

The Synod of Vienne (September 16, A. D. 1112), composed of French and Burgundian bishops, and convoked by Archbishop Guido, the papal legate, was not so considerate in its treatment of the German Emperor. Investitures were condemned as "*heretical.*" It may be well to state here that, in those times, not only formal errors of faith, but also abuses referable to a principle or formulated into a law, were called *heresies.*[1] The synod also pronounced sentence of excommunication against Henry for having laid violent hands on the Head of the Church.[2] In the synods of Beauvais and Rheims, the papal legate, *Cuno*, Bishop of Praeneste, excommunicated the Emperor, and the sentence was confirmed by a council held (A. D. 1115) in the great city of Cologne, on German territory.

A large majority of the bishops professed their adherence to the decrees of the Church, and were reconciled to the Holy See; a few only remained obstinate and continued to support the Emperor.

When affairs were in this condition, Henry, accompanied by five bishops, crossed the Alps a second time, for the purpose of seizing upon the possessions which the margravine, Mathilda, had repeatedly conveyed to the Roman Church. In 1117, Henry went to Rome, under pretense of bringing

---

ing to the latter, Paschal says: "Quamvis conditio juramentis praeposita ab ipso et suis minus observata sit; — ego tamen eum nunquam anathematizabo et nunquam de investituris inquietabo. — Habet judicem Deum." The acts of the council ex variis auctorib., collecta in *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 49–70; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1899–1914. Here is found even a profession of faith made by the Pope. Cf. *Planck*, Acta inter Henr. V. et Paschalem II., Götting. 1785. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 284 sq.

[1] *Döllinger* (Engl. trans.), Vol. III., p. 340. (Tr.)

[2] *Conc. Viennen.*, in *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 73 sq. *Hefele*, l. c., p. 286 sq.

about an accommodation with the Pope, who, divining his real intention, fled to Beneventum. He wished to have himself crowned at Rome with the imperial diadem; but, as none of the cardinals would consent to perform the ceremony, he had it done by *Burdinus*, Archbishop of Braga, but this being an invasion of the papal right, drew upon the obsequious prelate the sentence of excommunication.

After the Emperor's departure, Paschal again returned to Rome, but died after being back a few days (January 21, A. D. 1118), before the termination of the contest.

To escape foreign interference, the cardinals proceeded at once to elect a successor, and their choice fell upon Cardinal John of Gaeta, chancellor of the Roman Church, who took the name of *Gelasius II.* The election was barely over, when Cencio Frangipani, a relative of the Pope-elect, but a partisan of Henry's, seized Gelasius and cast him into prison. Having been liberated by the indignant populace, he was obliged to seek refuge in Gaeta from the anger of Henry and his army of Germans. Here, in the presence, of a large number of cardinals, bishops, and princes of Southern Italy, Gelasius was solemnly consecrated.

The Emperor next sent an embassy to the new Pope, requiring him, under menace of proceeding to extremities in case of refusal, to confirm the Privilegium of Paschal. Gelasius replied that he would submit the matter to the decision of a synod; but Henry, apprehensive of the issue, and under the flimsy pretext of not having been consulted in the election of Gelasius, set up as antipope the deposed and excommunicated archbishop *Burdinus*, who took the name of *Gregory VIII.*

Gelasius published, from Capua, sentence of excommunication against both the Emperor and the antipope; but, being forced to take flight to escape imperial persecution, he sought refuge in the monastery of Clugny, where he died (January A. D. 1119).

A new election was at once proceeded with at Clugny, and at the instance of Cardinal Cuno, whom Gelasius had recommended for the office, the cardinals gave their suffrages to *Guido*, Archbishop of Vienne. Being descended from the royal house of Burgundy, and related to the Emperor and to the kings of France, England, and Denmark, Guido had at his command the influence and material resources so necessary to the protection of the pontifical office and dignity in those times.[1] He took the name of *Calixtus II.*, and was universally acknowledged as the lawful Head of the Church (1119–1124). The antipope, *Gregory VIII.*,[2] being supported only by the small party of the Emperor, was unable to hold out against the Normans and the Roman people, and died miserably in prison. After the conflict had continued for some time longer, and Germany and Italy had been overrun and laid waste, both countries demanded that Church and State should come to an understanding with each other and establish peace. This was the more acceptable to Henry, as his situation was daily becoming more critical.

The disputes concerning lay investiture between the archbishops of Canterbury and the Norman princes of England were the occasion of a work, written by the monk *Hugo*, of the monastery *of Fleury*, in which, avoiding the excesses of either party, he advocates a middle course, and endeavors to reconcile Church and State, royalty and the priesthood. In opposition to those who depreciated the dignity of civil power, he appeals to the authority of St. Paul in proof of the *divine institution of kings;* while, on the other hand, he maintains that kings should in no wise interfere with *the freedom of canonical elections*, should approve the choice when made, and give up the practice of investing with staff and ring.[3]

The *abbot, Godfrey of Vendôme*, who, as we have stated above, severely censured Pope Paschal for yielding to the demands and threats of Henry, now also assumed the office of mediator between Church and State.[4] He drew a distinction between *the investiture, by which a bishop, as such, was installed in his office*, and *that by which provision was made for his support;* the former, he said, was of divine, the latter of human right.

Following up this distinction, he condemned the practice of lay investiture in spiritual matters, and with the symbols of staff and ring, as a heresy; while admitting, on the other hand, that, *after a free canonical election* and episcopal consecration, *princes might, without trenching on the spiritual domain, convey secular possessions to the bishop by royal investiture*, employing in the ceremony whatever instruments in their judgment would best symbolize the conveyance. It was, he argued, the intention of Christ that the civil authority should be in accord, and not at variance, with the spiritual, and that both should co-operate in defense of the Church. An antagonism between them gives rise to schism and strife, and is harmful to body and soul alike. Church and State are both equally in danger when they run counter to each other. The Church, while defending her liberties, should be careful to guard against extremes. When persons, who might have been conciliated and won over by moderation, are driven to madness and acts of rashness by unseemly severity, those who so deal with them are not inspired from above.

---

[1] *Döllinger*, l. c., p. 343. (Tr.)

[2] Vita Burdini (*Baluz.* Miscell., Paris, 1680, T. III., p. 471 sq.)

[3] *Hugo*, Floriacens., lib. II., de regia potestate et de sacerdotali dignitate ad Henr. I. (*Baluz.* Miscellan., T. IV., Par. 1683.)

[4] *Godofred.* Vindonic., opusc. III., de Simonia et investitura laicor. ad Calixt. II. and Tractatus de ordinatione episcopor. et de investitura laicor. ad Petr. Leon. Cardinal. (Max. Bibl., T. XXI.)

These irenical investigations prepared the way for the solution of this long and painful difficulty, and furnished a basis for an accommodation between the Pope and the Emperor. As a preliminary step, the papal legates presented themselves to Henry, at Strasburg, and assured him that the restoration of peace was conditional on his renunciation of the claim to investiture. Henry then agreed, as he said, out of love to God, His Holy Church, and to Pope Calixtus, to give up the practice, and at Mousson swore to observe the promises he had made to the papal legates at Strasburg.

Calixtus II. was at this time attending a great synod at Rheims (A. D. 1119), at which were present four hundred and twenty-seven bishops and abbots, representing every country of the West; but, when informed of the convention entered into between Henry and his legates, he set out at once to Mousson, where the Emperor then was, to ratify its articles. It soon became evident, from the shifts to which Henry had recourse in treating with the papal legates, that he had no intention of keeping his word, and in consequence the Pope, who came unattended, avoided him altogether, and hastily returned to Rheims, where, with the consent of the Fathers, he excommunicated both him and the antipope, and absolved the subjects of the former from their oath of allegiance until such time as a change should have come over the sentiment of the German Emperor.

In the meantime, affairs in Germany wore a serious aspect. The people grew restless, and indications of an outbreak startled Henry, and warned him not to bring upon himself the fate of his father. Calixtus, in a letter dated February 19, 1122, spoke to him in the spirit of a father and a prudent friend, admonishing him, solemnly and for the last time, that "the Church had not the least intention of trenching upon his rights." "We do not aspire," Calixtus went on to say, "to kingly or imperial splendor. Let the Church have what is Christ's, and let the Emperor retain what is his. If the Emperor take heed of our words, he shall not only rise to a height of dignity becoming his kingly and imperial rank, but he shall also secure for himself the crown of life eternal."

After some preliminary diplomacy, Henry accepted the articles of the *Concordat of Worms* (September 23, 1122), by which an end was put to the *contest on investitures*, after it had lasted through fifty years. In order to secure the permanency of the alliance between the papacy and the empire, Calixtus II., now enjoying the fullest liberty of action, convoked the First Council of Lateran, or the

NINTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 1123).

There were present at this council close upon three hundred bishops and six hundred abbots, from every quarter of the Catholic world. It confirmed the Concordat of Worms, the articles of which were substantially as follows: The emperor shall resign to God, to Saints Peter and Paul, and to the Catholic Church, the practice of investiture with ring and crosier; he shall permit all the churches of the empire to exercise the fullest freedom in the election and consecration of bishops, as the laws of the Church require; the election of German bishops (i. e. exclusive of Italian and Burgundian) shall take place in *presence of the emperor;* bishops shall receive investiture of their fiefs, and the royal privileges and prerogatives attached to them by the *imperial scepter*, if Germans *before*, and if Italians *after* consecration, but, in any case, after the expiration of six months.[1] In return for these grants, bishops shall promise fidelity to the emperor; in case an election be contested, the claims of the contestants shall be decided by a provincial synod, by whose judgment the emperor shall abide; and, finally, the emperor shall restore to the Roman Church all the possessions and regalia of St. Peter.

The Council also renewed the grant of indulgences made to the *Crusaders* by Urban II., and passed twenty-three canons, providing for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. These were chiefly directed against incontinent and simoniacal ecclesiastics; contumacious adherents of the late antipope; incestuous marriages; unauthorized absolution from censures; violation of the Truce of God; laymen who forcibly seized the offerings made to Churches, and against forgers of ecclesiastical documents. The limits of parochial jurisdiction were also prescribed, and the rights of the ordinary over priests, whether secular or regular, having the care of souls, defined and sustained.[1]

---

[1] The emperor, enjoying by this clause a wider latitude in *German* than Italian or Burgundian territory, might indefinitely prevent a *German* bishop elect, who was offensive to him, from entering upon his office, but could place no such obstacle in either Italy or Burgundy. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 336.

When these conciliar acts had been gone through, the Fathers solemnly canonized *Conrad*, Bishop of Constance, who died A. D. 976.

The *Concordat* put an end to the traffic by laymen in ecclesiastical dignities, and *opened* a sort of via media to the moderate men of both parties. Hitherto, emperors, wholly ignoring the *ecclesiastical* character of the episcopal office, had conferred investiture with the *symbols of spiritual jurisdiction and authority*, apparently implying that such jurisdiction and authority were the legitimate outgrowth of secular power, and entirely dependent upon it. The bishops, on the other hand, and notably after the time of Gregory VII., forgetting or overlooking the fact that the episcopal office was in a sense *political*, not unfrequently attempted to entirely exclude secular princes from a voice in the election of bishops. The Concordat therefore *established* a via media, marked out a middle course, satisfied both parties. It gave to Church and State what rightfully belonged to each, and refused to either what was not justly its due. But, in doing so much, it did more; *it sowed the seeds of mutual distrust between Church and State, and eventually brought about their estrangement.* But these consequences were remote, and in no proper sense appreciated, if at all foreseen, at the time. Universal joy was expressed upon the publication of the peace, and many documents, bearing the date of 1122, hailed the auspicious event as the dawn of a new and glorious era.

Concerning the *Homagium*, against which Urban II. and Paschal II. had so strenuously contended, the Concordat was silent, and seemed, from this fact, to countenance its continuance. There can be no doubt but that Calixtus II. was quite as keenly alive as his predecessors had been to the impropriety of a bishop taking such an oath, and knew fully as well as they that the practice would jeopardize the liberty of the Church; but, on the other hand, he well knew, also, that if he would insist upon its absolute and immediate discontinuance, he might again give occasion to a terrible war, and thus, without at all benefiting, bring innumerable evils upon the Church. The usual formula of the Homagium ran as follows: "I will from this day forward, according to the best of my knowledge and power, be faithful to the Emperor; take no part in any plot against his life or limb, his empire, or his lawfully constituted authority; within the limits of his empire, I will support him, to the best of my ability and power, against any one who may attempt to rob him of his imperial rights."

---

[1] *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 274-287; *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1109-1118; see also *Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I., p. 421. *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., pp. 75, 76. Supplements taken by the Tr. from *Palma*, Vol. II., p. 196 sq.—Only some stiff zealots were not satisfied with this treaty, as the Archbp. Conrad of Salzburg, whose life see in *Pez*, Thesaurus anecdot., T. II., Pt. III., p. 227. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 333-344.

It was useless for the emperors to attempt to influence papal elections. All such attempts were quietly frustrated by the secrecy and dispatch with which the elections were conducted.

B.—FROM HONORIUS TO THE DEATH OF EUGENE III. (A. D. 1153.)

ITALIAN REPUBLICANISM—ARNOLD OF BRESCIA—SECOND CRUSADE—ST. BERNARD AND HIS WORK, "DE CONSIDERATIONE."

Mansi, T. XXI., p. 319 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1117; vita, epp. Romanor. Pontificum et acta Concilior. *Watterich*, T. II., p. 157–322, for Honorius II. — Eugenius III. — *Neander*, St. Bernard and His Age, Berlin (1813), 1848. †**Ratisbonne*, Histoire de St. Bernard, ed. II., Paris, 1843, 2 T.; German, by *Reiching*, Tüb. 1843; Eng. transl., New York, 1855. *Neander*, Ch. H., Eng. transl., Vol. V., p. 189–211. *Katerkamp*, Ch. H., Vol. V., p. 355–470. *Jansen*, Wilibald of Stablo, etc.

§ 218. *Honorius II.* (A. D. 1124–1130)—*Innocent II.* (A. D. 1130–1143)—*Lucius II.* (A. D. 1144–1145)—*Eugenius III.* (A. D. 1145–1153.)

Upon the death of Calixtus II. (December 13, A. D. 1124), the suffrages of the electoral college were given to Cardinal Teobaldo; but, as many favored Lambert, Bishop of Ostia, who had been set up as an opponent by the powerful Robert Frangipani, Teobaldo resigned his claims, and Lambert, after having been formally elected, was universally recognized, and ascended the papal throne under the name of *Honorius II.* Henry V., the last of the emperors of the *Franconian*[1] line, died May 23, 1125. The election of his successor, *Lothaire II.*, Duke of Saxony, was chiefly due to the influence of Cardinal *Gerhard*, the papal legate. Lest the election of bishops might not be *perfectly free*, if conducted *in his presence*, the newly elected Emperor *abolished the practice;* and further ordained that bishops, instead of the *Homagium*, should take simply *an oath of fidelity*, not before, but *after* consecration.[2]

The election of a successor to Honorius II. († A. D. 1130) was the occasion of a fresh schism. Among the Cardinals was one Pier Leone, of a powerful Roman family, wealthy and ambitious, who aspired to the high dignity of the papacy. Hence those of the College of Cardinals who were solicitous for the Church's good and sensitive to her honor, knowing the designs of Pier Leone, hastened the election of Cardinal Gregory Papareschi, who took the name of *Innocent II.* Pier Leone, relying upon the influence of his family, the number and daring of the adherents who had been gained over to his side by a lavish distribution of money, had himself elected under the name of *Anaclete II.*[3]

---

[1] Not of the *Saxon*, as Abbé Darras incorrectly states (Vol. III., p. 201); neither did this dynasty rule for two hundred and seven years, but only for one hundred and one (A. D. 1024–1125). Abbé Darras labors apparently under the impression that the Saxon and Franconian are one and the same line. (Tr.)

[2] *Anonymi* Narratio de elect. Lotharii (*Eckhard.* Quaternio vett. Monumentor., p. 46). Cf. in *Pistorius-Struve*, T. I., p. 671: "Concordantibus itaque in electione regis universis regni principibus, quid juris regiae dignitatis imperium, quid libertatis reginae coelestis, i. e. ecclesiae sacerdotium habere deberet, stabili ratione praescribitur. — Habeat ecclesia liberam in spiritualibus electionem, *nec regio metu extortam*, *nec praesentia principis* ut antea coarctatam, vel ulla petitione restrictam; habeat Imperatoria dignitas electum libere, consecratum canonice, regalibus *per sceptrum*, sine pretio tamen, investire solemniter, et in fidei suae ad justi favoris obsequium (salvo quidem ordinis sui proposito) sacramentis obligare stabiliter." Against any misrepresentations of this emperor's character, cf. *Gervais*, Polit. Hist. of Germany, Vol. II., Lps. 1842. *Jaffé*, Hist. of the German Empire under Lothaire II., Berlin, 1843, and †*Jansen*, Wilibald of Stablo and Corvey, the abbot, statesman, and scholar (mediator between State and Church, under Lothaire II., Conrad III., and Frederic I.), Münster, 1854.

[3] *Arnulphi* Sagiens. Archidiac. Tract. de Schism. Petr. Leon. (*Muratori*, T.

As nearly all Rome favored Anaclete, Innocent withdrew from the city and retired into France. The schism was closed, after it had lasted eight years, by the exertions of the *Venerable Peter of Clugny* and *St. Bernard of Clairvaux.* They induced Philip VI. of France and the powerful and stubborn William of Aquitaine to recognize Innocent as lawful Pope.

St. Bernard crossed the Alps in the cause of Innocent, was his great support at the synod of Pisa (A. D. 1134), and finally succeeded in bringing all the Lombard cities under his obedience.

In 1136, Lothaire II. conducted Innocent in triumph to Rome, and in 1138 the antipope Anaclete died. His party elected a successer, who took the name of *Victor IV.* But the new antipope was easily persuaded by St. Bernard to submit to Pope Innocent, and this closed the schism. Lothaire II., who was called another Constantine, and who, during the schism, had gone twice to Rome to defend the cause of Innocent against Roger, whom the antipope had created King of Sicily, received as a *vassal* of the Pope all the allodial possessions given by the margravine Mathilda to the Holy See. The harmonious relations thus established between the papacy and the empire were frequently represented by writers as *analogous to those of Christian matrimony.*

In nearly every bishopric of Northern Italy there were at this time two incumbents of antagonistic principles on ecclesiastical and civil polity. While the one strenuously upheld the papal, the other was equally earnest in his advocacy of the imperial claims.

Moreover, there were here and there clusters of the population whose ancestors had lived under the old Roman government, and who had in consequence inherited its venerable traditions. They had, in spite of the Lombard conquest, retained possession of their territories, and were still

---

III., Pt. I.; *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I.) *Anacleti* Epp. (Recueil des historiens des Gaules, T. XV., p. 360.) — *Reimbaldi* Ep. de Schism. (ibid., p. 326.) *Innoc. II.* Epp. ad Germ. in Cod. Udalrici (*Eccard.*, T. II.)

in the enjoyment of their ancient *municipal rights.*[1] Living in towns and cities, they formed a kind of *third class*, equally opposed to both clergy and nobility, and began to form themselves into powerful *republics.* The bishops, being elected without interference from civil authority, relinquished, on their part, rights formerly exercised by them over these cities, which grew little by little in wealth and importance, and eventually became very flourishing. Their example was followed by Rome, where the ceaseless contests on papal elections favored the movement.

The *ancient senate* was restored under Innocent,[2] and under *Lucius II.* a *patrician* was elected to represent the ancient consular authority. The tide of republicanism set in with unusual violence, uprisings followed, and Pope Lucius, in endeavoring, during this popular ferment, to get possession of the Capitol, was mortally wounded by the blow of a stone. This republican spirit had been, if not enkindled, certainly fanned into flame by *Arnold of Brescia,*[3] a young clergyman of irreproachable moral character, gifted with a fervid and impetuous eloquence, and who was at this time a lector in one of the churches of Brescia, and had been formerly a disciple of Abelard's. He sought to awaken in the breasts of the people the glorious memories of ancient Rome; held up the Church of the apostolic age as the pattern for all time; and appealed to the poverty of those days when condemning the wealthy clergy of his own. He called upon the people to overturn the established order of things, and dazzled their imaginations with glowing visions of reforms never to be carried out, and of utopian systems impossible to realize. In the midst of all this republican glow and fever, Innocent II. convoked the Second Lateran, or

---

[1] *Savigny,* Hist. of Civil Law during the Middle Ages, Vol. I., p. 409; Vol. III., p. 103 sq. *Bethmann-Hollweg,* Origin of the Lombard municipal rights, Bonn, 1846. *Hegel,* Hist. of the constitutions of Italian cities, Lps. 1847, 2 vols. Cf. Hist. Polit. Papers, Vol. 45, p. 988 sq.

[2] *Otto Frising.* Chron., lib. VII., c. 27. *Muratori,* Hist. of Italy, Vol. VII., p. 84.

[3] *Otto Frising.* de Reb. gest. Frider., l. II., c. 20. *St. Bernard.* ep. 195 ad Episc. Constant. a. 1140: Arnoldum loquor de Brixia, qui utinam tam sanae esset doctrinae, quam districtae est vitae. Et si vultis scire, homo est neque manducans neque bibens, solo cum diabolo esuriens et sitiens sanguinem animarum. Cf. *Franke,* Arnold of Brescia and his Age, Zurich, 1825. *Raumer,* Vol. VI., p. 34–38.

TENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 1139).

This council confirmed whatever had been done to secure the peace of the Church. It was attended by nearly one thousand patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots, representing the various countries of Christendom. Roger was excommunicated for abetting schism and protecting the antipope, *Anaclete II.* All those who had been raised to ecclesiastical dignities by antipopes were deposed. *Peter of Bruis* and *Arnold of Brescia* were condemned; and simony, clerical incontinency, and other crying evils of the times, were summed up in thirty canons, and prohibited under the severest censure.[1] Arnold of Brescia was, in consequence of this conciliar condemnation, driven successively from Italy, France, and Switzerland, but he returned after the death of Innocent.

The wild republican dreams of a universal dominion, which should rival the glories of ancient Rome, spread rapidly among the people. The Pope, according to the new programme, was to content himself with the tithes and the voluntary offerings of the people. "The Senate and Roman People" sent a pompous letter to Conrad III., inviting him to take up his residence in Rome, "whence, like Constantine and Justinian of old, he might give laws to the whole world."[2] They said that, following the precept of Christ, they would render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto the priest the things that are the priest's.[3] They invited Arnold of Brescia to return and help in restoring the republic and reforming the Church. In vain did Pope *Eugene III.*, formerly a monk of the monastery of Clairvaux, and afterward abbot of St. Anastasius, near Rome, and St. Bernard labor to induce the Romans to submit. The Pope was obliged to transfer his residence to *Viterbo*, where he learned the sad news of the capture of Edessa by the Turks (A. D. 1144). He at once communicated the intelligence to *Louis VII.*, King of France, and commissioned St. Bernard to preach a new crusade. It required but little persuasion to make Louis take the red cross of the Crusaders. He was already under obligation to do so by his brother's vow, but the stimulus of a guilty conscience furnished a still stronger motive. In a war with Theobald, Count of Champagne, he had set fire to a church in which thirteen hundred men, women, and children had taken refuge, and the sight of the burnt bodies filled his mind with such grief and despair that he determined to do what he could toward atoning for his crime by leading an army to the Holy Land. His remorse was quickened by the sweeping eloquence of St. Bernard, whose voice stirred to the depths the hearts of young and old of both sexes. It was determined that a *second crusade* should be at once set on foot (A. D. 1147).

---

[1] Cf. *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 523–546. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1207–1218. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 388 sq.

[2] *Jaffé*, Hist. of the German Empire under Conrad III., Hanover, 1845.

[3] On this occasion, the pretended donation of Constantine the Great to Sylvester was rejected as false: "Mendacium vero illud et fabula haeretica, in qua refertur, Constantinum Sylvestro imperialia simoniace concessisse in Urbe, ita detecta est, ut etiam mercenarii et mulierculae quoslibet etiam doctissimos super hoc concludant et dictus apostolicus cum suis cardinalibus in civitate prae pudore apparere non audeant." (*Martène* et *Durand*, Collect. ampliss., T. II., ep. 384, p. 556.)

Conrad III., Emperor of Germany, did not yield so readily to the influence of the monk of Citeaux. Bernard met him in the imperial diet at Spires,[1] during Christmastide, and endeavored to impress upon him the vital importance of a fresh crusade. The Emperor promised to take the cross at Ratisbon, some time later.

Adam, abbot of Eberbach, completed the work which Bernard had begun, by prevailing on Conrad to take the cross and embark in the enterprise. The French and German army got together on this occasion was incontestably better equipped, better disciplined, and in every way superior to that which went on the first crusade; but it was on this very account over-confident, and put but little trust in Him who is the God of battles, and who weighs kings and people in His balance. What with the perfidy of the Greeks, the jealousies of the European captains, and the inclemency of the season, the expedition turned out a disastrous failure; and when the poor remnants of the once magnificent army that had set out from Europe were brought back from the East, a cry of reproach and indignation rose from all sides against St. Bernard, who had contributed so much toward the organization of the crusade by his enthusiasm, his personal magnetism, and his glowing eloquence. But the faith of the great saint could not be shaken by the disastrous issue of the expedition. He protested that he acted on the authority of a heavenly commission; and, in writing to Pope Eugene on the subject, said that the counsels and ways of God are incomprehensible; and, referring to Moses, reminded the Pope that, although the work of the great lawgiver was, beyond all question, one bearing on its very face the divine sanction, still it was never given to him to enter the Land of Promise, because of the misconduct of the Jews. And then, appealing to the authorization of the Pope for what he had done, and to his miracles, of which Eugene had been himself a witness, he went on to say: "The testimony of my conscience is my vindication. If I must make a choice between murmurs directed against myself personally and those directed against my God, I much prefer the former to the latter. I had rather have whatever there is of blame laid to *my* charge than to hear God's holy name profaned." He closes by boldly declaring that the crusaders had none to blame but themselves for the disastrous issue of the expedition. They were unworthy of their high mission and of the holy promise to which it led. They were foolhardy and presumptuous, had given rein to their passions, and filled their camps with debauchery and shameful disorders.

---

[1] Cf. Dr. *Kästle*, St. Bernard of Clairvaux's Journey to and Sojourn in the Diocese of Constance (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, year 1868, Vol. III., p. 273–315).

In the meantime, Eugene III., aided by the people of Tivoli, re-entered Rome, whence he was again obliged to withdraw to escape the extravagant demands of the populace. He retired to France, to the monastery of St. Bernard, his master in the spiritual life, with whom he proposed to take counsel in devising measures for the restoration of peace to the Church. But the jealousy of the cardinals, who charged him with being a dependent of a French abbot, determined him to return to Rome (A. D. 1149), where he was sustained, in spite of the party of Arnold, by Roger, King of the Sicilies. Here he received from St. Bernard the celebrated work "*On Meditation*" (*De Consideratione*),[1] in four books, each of which was sent separately.

In this work, St. Bernard lays aside all thoughts of the pontifical dignity, and addresses Eugene with the freedom and frankness of a father speaking to a son, which, it must be admitted, is a liberty rarely taken with the great of this world, and an indubitable proof of the sincerity of the friendship which subsisted between these two great men. Bernard warns Eugene not to allow the multiplicity of external affairs consequent upon his office, to interfere with his regular habits of meditation, or to cool his love of divine things. He next draws the Pope's attention to his high position among Christian nations; tells him that it is his duty to arbitrate their quarrels, and establish peace; and then goes on to sketch in outline the exalted duties of the successor of St. Peter, which, he says, are a heavy burden to be borne by poor weak human nature. In this work, and in many private letters to Eugene, Bernard is equally frank in speaking of the abuses to which, in that age, those who wielded the power of the papacy, were liable. He instances the tendency to centralize ecclesiastical government; the numerous and unnecessary appeals to Rome, which were frequently prompted by dishonest motives; the increasing tendency of abbots to put themselves above or beyond the jurisdiction of bishops; the unwarrantable assumptions of papal legates; the insatiable greed of the Italians, and their extortions of money under false pretenses; the scandalous conduct of the Roman clergy, and the arrogance and lawlessness of the Roman people. While speaking of the tendency to centralize Church government, he administers this reproof: "Perhaps the next step will be to subject the Holy Angels to thy rule."[1] And again: "Episcopal jurisdiction may as well be abolished, since no bishop has it now in his power to punish offenses against God; he is no longer competent to give an independent judgment in his own diocese."[2] Once more: "Remember that the Holy Roman Church, over which thou presidest by the grace of God, is the Mother, and not the mistress, of all other churches; that thou art likewise, not the Lord of the bishops, *but one of their number*."[3] We should not, however, lose sight of the fact, that Bernard's habit of censuring his own age, and passing over what was good in it, not unfrequently led him to mistake the true bearing of *certain phenomena inseparable from those times;* hence, in his later works, he often corrects former statements, and admits that it was the duty of the Pope to take upon himself the administration of many things not strictly belonging to his office, but the neglect of which would be detrimental to his dignity.[4] His earnest desire and the yearning of his soul is expressed to the Pope in the following language: "*Would that I might have the happiness of seeing, before I die, the restoration of that glorious age of the Church* when the Apostles cast out their nets, not in search of silver and gold, but to take hauls of precious souls."[5]

---

[1] De Consideratione, libb. IV., in *Bernardi* opp. ed. Venet., T. II., p. 413 sq., in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 182–185; separate ed. by *Krabinger*, Landshut, 1845, and by *Schneider*, Berlin, 1850. Here also belongs *Gerhohi* (Rector of the Cathedral-school and Canon of Augsburg) expositio in Psalm. lxiv., sive liber de corrupto ecclesiae statu ad Eugen. III. (*Galland.* bibl., T. XIV., p. 549 sq.; *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 193.)

Both Eugene and Bernard died (A. D. 1153) shortly after the completion of the work "*On Meditation*"—the former July 8th, and the latter August 20th, without seeing the end of the extravagant dreams of republicanism in Rome.

---

[1] Ep. 231.

[2] Ep. 178.

[3] Lib. IV., c. 7. Cf. Vol. I., p. 676, and Vol. II., p. 38.

[4] Lib. IV., c. 2, 3.

[5] Quis mihi det, antequam moriar, videre ecclesiam Dei sicut in diebus antiquis? Ep. 238; ad Eugen. III., ep. I., nro. 6. (*Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 182, p. 430.)

C.—THE HUNDRED YEARS STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFENS—FREDERIC I., HENRY VI., FREDERIC II., CONRAD IV., AND CONRADIN († A. D. 1268).

Mansi, T. XXI., p. 785 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1333 sq.: Vita, epp. Rom. Pontificum et acta Conciliar. *Watterich*, T. II., p. 323–748, on Hadrian IV., Alexander III., etc., to Celestine III. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Lps. (1823) 1841, sq., 6 vols. *Zimmermann*, The Hohenstaufens; or, The Struggle of the Monarchy *against the Pope and Republican liberty*, Stuttg. 1838, 2 pts. *John von Müller*, Journeys of Popes, nros. 6 and 7. **Reuter*, Pope Alexander III. and the Church of his Age, 2d ed., Lps. 1860 sq., 3 vols. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 469 sq.

§ 219. *Hadrian IV.* (A. D. 1155–1159)—*Alexander III.* (A. D. 1159–1181)—*Frederic I. and Henry II., King of England—Thomas à Becket.*

Hadrian IV. succeeded in suppressing the spirit of demagogism in Rome. The Pope, whose family name was *Richard Breakspeare*, was a native of England, and the only one of that nation that ever sat upon the papal throne.

Driven from home by the harsh treatment of his father, who did menial service in the monastery of St. Alban's, he wandered up and down the country for some time, after which he passed over to France, and entered the monastery of St. Rufus, near Arles. As a monk, he was distinguished by close application to study, regularity of life, a noble and generous disposition, and eminent talents. These qualities soon raised him to the abbacy; but the monks shortly grew tired of him, and falsely accused him to Pope Eugene III., who, divining the real motives of Breakspeare's enemies, called him to Rome, and created him cardinal-bishop of Albano. He was next sent as papal legate to the kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, and while in this embassy showed such capacity for public business, and acquired so great a reputation as a diplomate, that on his return to Rome, whither an account of his labors had preceded him, he was unanimously called to the papal throne. Arnold of Brescia was at this time in Rome, devising plans for the revival of Pagan principles and the restoration of a republican form of government. To enter a contest, with any hope of success, against popular passion, on the one hand, and royal encroachments on the other, was a task of no ordinary difficulty; but the poor English exile, who had been so providentially led, step by step, to the most exalted dignity in Christendom, was quite equal to it, and, as the event proved, capable of maintaining the glorious traditions of the See of St. Peter.

He at once employed the most vigorous measures for the restoration of order; and by laying Rome under *interdict*, struck an effective blow at those who were disturbing the peace of the city. The senators, yielding to the representations and appeals of both clergy and people, broke off their connection with Arnold of Brescia, and made their submission to the Pope.

Arnold found refuge and protection with some Italian nobles; but *Frederic Barbarossa*, who had lately come into Italy, and who, being imbued with the old ideas of absolute imperialism, detested the wild republican dreams of the Romans, demanded the surrender of Arnold, and, having got possession of him, handed him over to the papal authorities.[1] The *Prefect* of Rome sentenced him to be hung, after which he was burnt, and his ashes flung into the Tiber (A. D. 1155).

With *Frederic* commences the struggle between the Papacy and the house of Hohenstaufen, which continued for a whole century. The expedition against Rome, which Conrad III. had contemplated for the restoration of imperial rights and prerogatives now almost forgotten, was warmly taken up by Frederic, who had already led an army into Italy, and systematically prosecuted until a final adjustment was reached. After having been crowned King of Lombardy, at Pavia, Frederic proceeded on his way to Rome; but the Pope, suspicious of his ulterior intentions, sent an embassy to meet him. They shortly returned, with assurances from Frederic that the Pope's person would be respected and his property protected. Hadrian immediately set out to meet him, and coming up with him at Sutri, a difficulty was raised concerning a question of etiquette. According to a custom, sanctioned by the usage of former emperors and kings, and prescribed by *German* law,[1] the king should have held the Pope's stirrup, as a mark of respect to his dignity. This Frederic indignantly refused to do, and the Pope in consequence denied him the usual courtesy of the kiss of peace.

---

[1] Cf. the just appreciation of Arnold by *Raumer*, in his Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. II., p. 31.

After a short discussion on the matter, the king yielded, but would not listen to the extravagant pretensions of the Roman nobles, who wished him to receive the imperial dignity at *their* hands.

Frederic was now crowned Emperor by the Pope. His professions were fair enough, but his ambitious designs did not escape the more penetrating of those who came in contact with him. It was evident that he intended to use the Pope to further his own projects, and to avail himself of the venerable prestige which attached to the Holy See, to establish a *universal political monarchy.*

When King *William II.*, on the death of Roger (A. D. 1154), seized upon the kingdom of Sicily without consulting the Holy See, of which it was a fief, Hadrian wrote him a letter of remonstrance, in which he addressed William as "Lord." The latter taking offense at this manner of title, invaded the Papal States, shut the Pope up in Benevento, and compelled him to conclude an ignominious peace (A. D. 1156). By this treaty, the Pope absolved William from sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him at the opening of the war, invested him with Sicily and Apulia, and acknowledged him as the lawful lord of all the provinces and cities that had fallen into his hands since the death of Roger. William, on his part, promised to remain at peace with the Holy See, and *to pay tribute for all provinces held in fief;* but he forbade any one to appeal to Rome without having first obtained the royal permission, and claimed the right of *confirming all bishops canonically elected*.[1]

---

[1] *Helmoldii* Chronicon Slavor., lib. I., c. 80. *Otto Frising.* II. 21. — *Baron.* ad an. 1155, nro. 4. Cf. *Raumer*, Vol. II., p. 39 sq. We read in the *Suabian Mirror:* "The Pope receives both swords from God; the spiritual he retains, and the temporal he hands over to the emperor. When he mounts his white charger, *the emperor shall hold his stirrup.*" Articles 9 and 10 of the preface. The *Saxon Mirror* also says: "The Pope will also, on certain occasions, ride on a white horse, *when the emperor shall hold his stirrup,* that the saddle may not turn over."

Frederic I. had contemplated subduing William, and was indignant that the Pope should have come to terms with him. A number of discontented cardinals seized the occasion to still further exasperate him against the Holy See, and, while in this frame of mind, he forbade his clergy to accept any benefice from the Pope, and, in direct violation of the Concordat of Worms, disposed of several bishoprics according to his pleasure, and bestowed investiture on the bishop of Verdun. Having, during a visit to Constantinople, in the company of his uncle, Conrad III.,[2] gained a knowledge of the relations of the Greek emperors to the Church, he seemed to greatly prefer their despotic rule to the more enlightened policy of such emperors as Charlemagne, the Othos, and Henry II.

In 1158 the Pope wrote Frederic a letter, which was carried by the papal envoys *Roland* and *Bernard*, complaining of these encroachments on the rights of the Holy See, and of the Emperor's conduct in the case of *Eskyl*, Archbishop *of Lund*, in Sweden, who, while returning from a pilgrimage to Rome, had been robbed and taken captive by a body of German knights, near Thionville. The Emperor had not alone allowed the offense to go unpunished, but had also omitted to do anything toward releasing the prisoner. In this letter, the Pope called to his mind the many obligations he was under to the Holy See, and mentioned, among other things, that he had *received from it the imperial crown.* He went on to say that it would have given him great pleasure, had he been able, to grant him other favors (beneficia) besides imperial coronation.[1]

---

[1] See document in *Baron.* ad an. 1156, n. 4 sq.

[2] *John of Salisbury* says, ep. 59: Scio quid Teutonicus moliatur. Eram enim Romae praesidente b. Eugenio, quando prima legatione missa in regni sui initio tanti ausi impudentiam tumor intolerabilis lingua incauta detexit. Promittebat enim, se totius orbis reformaturum imperium, urbi subjiciendum orbem, eventuque facili omnia subacturum, si ei ad hoc solius Romani pontificis favor adesset. *Id enim agebat, ut in quemcunque demutatis inimicitiis materialem gladium imperator, in eundem Romanus pontifex spiritualem gladium exerceret.* If Frederic did not at once carry out such views, with the device, "Quod principi placet, legis habet vigorem," he was certainly only prevented by *Wibald* of Stablo, a man of great merit, who died in the year 1158. Cf. *Jansen,* Wibald, etc., p. 176 sq., and †*Ficker,* Rainald of Dassel, Cologne, 1850, p. 14.

This letter, which was read in the diet of Besançon, called forth indignant expressions of surprise. The most offensive interpretation was put upon the word "*beneficium*," which, according to the linguistic usage of that age, might signify a feoffage—a meaning which the context and grammatical construction would by no means bear out. But the papal legates, who were the bearers of this letter, were little fitted, by their tact or temper of mind, to correct any misapprehension that might arise from ambiguity of language, or to appease the angry passions of the assembly. One of them, Cardinal Roland of Siena, was imprudent enough to ask, when exception was taken to the language of the Pope's letter: "From whom then, if not from the Pope, did the Emperor receive his dignity?" The question was nearly costing the legate his life. The embassy was at once disgracefully dismissed, and commanded to return directly to Rome. Intercourse between the bishops of the Empire and the Holy See was as far as possible interrupted, appeals were restricted, and pilgrimages prohibited. Frederic published a circular letter in justification of his conduct, in which he gave a statement of what had been done, and explained his reasons for so acting.[2] "Whereas," says he, "our right to govern comes from God alone, through the choice of the princes; and whereas our Lord, at His passion, committed the government of the world to two swords;[3] and whereas *Peter* the Apostle gave to the world the precept, 'Fear God, honor the King,' it is evident that whoever claims 'we have received the imperial crown as a *beneficium* from the Pope,' runs counter to the divine order of things, contradicts the doctrine of Peter, and is a liar." The Emperor at the same time sent a pompous letter to the Pope, in which he said: "God made use of the Empire to exalt the Church in the capital of the world, and now, in that same capital, the Church—not, as we think, with the approval of God—seeks to bring ruin upon the Empire. We had rather lay down our crown, than suffer it and ourselves to be so degraded."

---

[1] Cf. *Radevicus* De gest. Frider., lib. I., c. 8–10 (*Urstisius*, T. I., p. 480), in *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 790: "Debes enim, gloriosissime fili, ante oculos mentis reducere, quam gratanter et quam jucunde alio anno mater tua St. Rom. ecclesia te susceperit, — quantam tibi et dignitatis plenitudinem contulerit et honoris, et qualiter *imperialis insigne coronae libentissime conferens*, benignissimo gremio suo tuae sublimitatis apicem studuerit confovere. — Neque tamen poenitet nos, desideria tuae voluntatis in omnibus implevisse, sed si majora *beneficia* excellentia tua de manu nostra suscepisset, si fieri posset, considerantes quanta ecclesiae et nobis per te incrementa possint et commoda provenire, non immerito gauderemus." In *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1335. *Hefele*, l. c., Vol. V., p. 482 sq.

[2] Cf. *Neander* (Engl. trans. by *Torrey*), Vol. IV., p. 164 et sq. (Tr.)

[3] Luke xxii. 38.

The Pope at once wrote a second letter to the Emperor, in which the offensive expression was satisfactorily explained to mean deeds of kindness, or benevolent disposition (bonum factum), and here this difficulty came to an end.[1]

It was no easy matter for any Pope to remain at peace with Frederic, unless he were willing to make a complete surrender of his rights.

In 1158 the Emperor crossed the Alps a second time, at the head of one hundred and twenty thousand men, and after humbling Milan, the proud head of the republican confederation of the Lombard cities, called an assembly on the plain of *Roncaglia*,[2] and had four jurisconsults, of eminent names, from Bologna, to declare that, according to Roman law, he had a right to exercise the despotic power of the *ancient Roman emperors* (November 11). In virtue of this decision, which was entirely contrary to German tradition and usage, he coined money, levied tolls and imposts, and declared everything of any importance a royal prerogative, and, as a consequence, to be restored to the Emperor.

---

[1] Hadrian replied to the emperor: Licet hoc nomen, quod est, *beneficium*, apud quosdam in alia significatione, quam ex impositione habeat, assumatur; tunc tamen in ea significatione accipiendum fuerat, quam nos ipsi posuimus, et quam ex institutione sua noscitur retinere. Hoc enim nomen ex *bono* et *facto* est editum, et dicitur beneficium apud nos non feudum, sed bonum factum. — Per hoc vocabulum "*contulimus*," nihil aliud intelleximus, nisi quod superius dictum est, imposuimus. (*Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 793; *Harduin*, l. c., 1336 sq.)

[2] These were *Bulgarus*, *Martinus Gosia*, *Jacobus* (de Porta Ravennate), and *Hugo* (de Alberico, also de Porta Ravennate). For an account of each, and their relations to each other, cf. *Savigny*, l. c., Vol. IV., p. 69–171; their decision in favor of Frederic, at p. 151 sq. "This violent change in the political condition of Northern and Central Italy, made under pretense of restoring things to what they had been in ancient times, invested the emperor with rights and prerogatives which did not at all belong to him. Bishops, princes, and cities were obliged to give up their sovereign rights and special privileges. These were indeed, in some cases, restored, but only when a title to them could be proved by early documents authorizing their exercise." *Hegel*, Hist. of Municipal Constitutions, Vol. II., p. 231–233. *Reuter*, Alexander III., Vol. I., p. 37.

These restrictions upon the privileges of cities, bishoprics, and cloisters excited a general feeling of discontent. New grievances were soon added, and of all the injured parties none had a juster right to complain than the Pope. Notwithstanding the Emperor's solemn promise to secure to the Holy See all its rights and possessions, he granted to Duke Guelf the entire inheritance of Mathilda, which had been confirmed to the Pope in the most precise terms by the Emperor Lothaire. He also laid a tax upon the possessions of the Roman Church; demanded the *homagium* from the prelates; and, in direct and open violation of the Concordat of Worms, intruded into the archiepiscopal see of Cologne, *Rainald of Dassel*, his own chancellor, and associate in every deed of wickedness, and the Pope's personal enemy; and into that of Ravenna, Guido, son of Count Blandrate, who, however, being a subdeacon of the Roman Church, could not pass to another without having first obtained permission, and this Hadrian refused to give. Frederic did not seem to be at all disquieted as to the view the Pope might take of his conduct. Instead of adopting a conciliatory policy, he seemed to seize every opportunity, even the most trivial, of taking exception to Hadrian's acts. His complaints sometimes resembled those of a pettish schoolboy rather than a dignified emperor. He took it ill that the Pope's name should have been placed before his own in public documents and letters emanating from the Holy See; that he had been addressed in the singular number; and that the bearer of a letter from the Pope to himself was a person unknown to every one at his court, and had retired immediately after delivering it. The Pope, weary of these continual annoyances, sent an embassy, consisting of five cardinals, to demand from the Emperor that he should never send his embassadors to

Rome with authority *to exercise any sovereign right or prerogative,* without having first informed the Holy See of such intention; that he should make no *levies upon the goods of the Roman Church,* except on the occasion of his coronation; that the bishops of Italy should take, instead of the *homagium*, the oath of fidelity; and, finally, that the revenues derived from the various provinces of the See of Rome, which had been seized and wrongly appropriated, should be restored. The Emperor, on the other hand, complained that peace had been made with the King of Sicily without his consent; that papal legates neglected to ask his permission to travel through his dominions, had taken up their residences in episcopal palaces, and oppressed the churches; and, finally, that unjust appeals had been taken to Rome.

It was not at all likely that Frederic, in his present temper of mind, would consent to an amicable settlement of the many difficulties between himself and the Pope,[1] and the latter, knowing such to be his disposition, openly told him that the rights, the possessions, and the liberties of the Roman Church would be maintained at any cost.[2] Hadrian—whose life, according to his own expression, had been passed between the anvil and the hammer—was preparing to excommunicate Frederic for apprehending and imprisoning two cardinals, when he died (September 1, A. D. 1159).[3]

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist. (Cox's transl.), Vol. IV., p. 11 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Hadriani* ep. ad Frideric. and the answer in *Baron.* ad an. 1159, nros. 5 and 6. Also in *Urstisius*, T. I., p. 562. Their authenticity is, without sufficient reason, denied by *Muratori*, Annal., T. VI., p. 536. Frederic's views concerning his position as emperor and his relation to the Church, are fully set forth by *Gottfried of Viterbo* (secretary and chaplain to the emperors Conrad III., Frederic I., and Henry VI.), in his Pantheon, Pt. XVI. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. VI., p. 360.)

[3] So much has been said recently of the donation of Ireland to England by the bull of Hadrian IV., and such fictitious importance has been attached to that instrument, that it has been thought well to give it here entire, with the reasons for its authenticity. The chief purpose of this bull, as will be seen from the context, was to restore religion to a better condition in Ireland, where it was at this time on the decline. The bull, as found in the Codex Vaticanus, and given in *Baronius*, Annales ad an. 1159, runs as follows:

"Hadrianus Episcopus servus servorum Dei, charissimo in Christo filio illustri Anglorum Regi, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem:

Notwithstanding the critical condition of the Church and the necessity of union among the cardinals, they could not

---

"Laudabiliter et fructuose de glorioso nomine propagando in terris, et aeternae felicitatis praemio cumulando in coelis, tua magnificentia cogitat, dum ad dilatandos Ecclesiae terminos, ac declarandam indoctis et rudibus populis Christianae Fidei veritatem, et vitiorum plantaria de agro Dominico extirpanda, sicut Catholicus Princeps, intendis, et ad id convenientius exequendum, consilium Apostolicae Sedis exigis et favorem. In quo facto, quanto altiori consilio et maiori discretione procedis, tanto in eo feliciorem progressum te, praestante Dno., confidimus habiturum, eo quod ad bonum exitum semper et finem soleant attingere, quae de ardore Fidei et religionis amore principium acceperunt. Sane Hiberniam, et omnes Insulas, quibus sol Iustitiae Christus illuxit, et quae documenta Fidei Christianae ceperunt, ad jus beati Petri, et sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae (quod tua et nobilitas recognoscit) non est dubium pertinere. Unde tanto in eis libentius plantationem fidelem, et germen gratum Deo inserimus, quantum id a nobis interno examine districtius prospicimus exigendum. Significasti siquidem nobis, fili in Christo charissime, te Hiberniae insulam, ad subdendum illum populum legibus, et vitiorum plantaria inde extirpanda, velle intrare, et de singulis domibus annuam unius denarii beato Petro velle solvere pensionem, et jura ecclesiarum illius terrae illibata et integra conservare."

"Nos itaque pium et laudabile desiderium tuum cum favore congruo prosequentes, et petitioni tuae benignum impendentes assensum, gratum et acceptum habemus, pro dilatandis Ecclesiae terminis, pro vitiorum restringendo decursu, pro corrigendis moribus, et virtutibus inserendis, pro Christianae religionis augmento, insulam illam ingrediaris, et quod ad honorem Dei, et salutem illius terrae spectaverit, exequaris; et illius terrae populus honorifice te recipiat, et sicut dominum veneretur; jure nimirum ecclesiastico illibato, et integro permanente, et salva beato Petro, et sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione. Si ergo quod concepisti animo, effectu duxeris complendum, stude gentem illam bonis moribus informare, et agas tam per te, quam per illos quos adhibes, quos fide, verbo, et vita idoneos esse perspexeris, ut decoretur ibi Ecclesia, plantetur et crescat Fidei Christianae religio, et quae ad honorem Dei, et salutem pertinent animarum, per te taliter ordinentur, ut a Deo sempiternae mercedis cumulum consequi merearis, et in terris gloriosum nomen valeas in saeculis obtinere." [Hucusque codice Vaticano.]

Annales Ecclesiastici, auctore Caesare Baronio Sorano Antuerpiae, M.DC.XXIX. (Ad an. 1159.)

The chief objection to the authenticity of this bull is based upon the absence of a date. *Francis Pagi*, speaking on this subject in his Breviarium Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum, says that, while *Baronius* leaves the date of Hadrian's bull undetermined, *Radulphus de Diceto* (who also gives the text of the bull in his *Imagines Historiarum*, p. 529), and, still later, *Rymer* (in his great work, "*Conventiones et acta publica inter reges Angliae,*" T. I., p. 5), refer it, but incorrectly, to the year 1154. This date is evidently incorrect, for Henry was crowned king of England on December 19, 1154, and consequently could not have received agree upon the choice of a new pope. The party devoted to the imperial interests elected Cardinal Octavian, who had

---

the bull before the expiration of the year. Hence, concludes Pagi, *Matthew of Paris* is right in referring it to the year 1155.

In treating of the pontificate of Alexander III., the same writer says (l. c., n. lxxviii.): "Because Henry, though having received the bull in 1155, did not undertake his expedition to Ireland until 1171, *Alford* (Annals of England) doubts the authenticity of the document."

Giraldus Cambrensis, a contemporary writer, after giving the diploma entire in his work "*On the Conquest of Ireland*," again does the same in his later work "*On His Own Exploits*" (Book II., chap. 11). "Hence," says Pagi, "*that document is genuine in every particular, and by no means supposititious.*" On its authority he goes on to say, Henry invaded Ireland in 1171, as many contemporary authors relate, and, among them, *Gervase* (in his Chron.) and *Roger Hoveden* (in his Annals), who says, ad an. 1171, that Henry crossed over to Ireland in this year for the purpose of subjugating the island, and, after having received the voluntary submission of its people, claimed it as his own. The same writer says also, that, in a national council, consisting of four archbishops and twenty-eight bishops (i. e. all the prelates of the island), the king and his heirs were recognized as the lords of the country forever. The instrument containing this recognition was sent by the king to Pope Alexander III., who *confirmed*, by his apostolic authority, the kingdom of Ireland to Henry and his heirs, in the same sense and form that it had been granted by the charter of the archbishops and bishops. It is said that the papal bull was accompanied with a *gold ring*, set with a costly *emerald*, intended to serve as a mark of investiture.

The authenticity of this bull is still further established by a letter of Donald O'Neil and some of the nobles of Ireland to Pope John XXII., complaining of the injustice done them by Hadrian's bull. The following are the most important passages: . . . "Et cum tanto tempore dicti reges (Hibernici) concessam a Deo sibi, haereditatem . . . defendissent . . . tandem Adrianus Papa, praedecessor vester, non tantum origine, quantum affectione et conditione, Anglicus, A. D. MCLXX., ad falsam, and plenam iniquitate, suggestionem Henrici Regis Angliae . . . dominium regni nostri, sub quadam certa verborum forma, eidem . . . contulit indebite . . . sicque nos privans honore regio, nostri absque culpa et sine rationabili causa, crudelioribus omnium bestiarum dentibus tradidit lacerandos." Another proof arises from the Pope's letter in reply, addressed to the King of England: . . . "Cum fel. rec. Adrianus papa praedecessor noster, sub certis modo et forma distinctis apertius Apost. literis, inde factis clarae memoriae Henrico Regi Angliae, Progenitori tuo Dominium Hiberniae concessisset, ipse Rex ac successores ipsius Reges Angliae usque ad haec tempora, modum et formam hujusmodi non servantes, quinimo transgredientes, indebite afflictionibus et gravaminibus inauditis importabilium servitutum ipsos diutius oppresserunt. . . . Ut autem de praedictis gravaminibus et querelis . . . tuis sensibus innotescat ad plenum, antedictas literas . . . cum forma literarum, quas praedictus Adrianus Praedecessor noster eidem Henrico Regi Angliae de terra Hiberniae concessit, tuae Magnitudini mittimus praesentibus some time previously deserted the cause of Hadrian, and declared himself an adherent of the Emperor. Octavian, who

---

inclusas. Datum," etc.—From Mac-Geoghan's Hist. *P. T. Carew*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Philadelphia, 1838, p. 404–412.

Abbé MacGeoghegan (Hist. of Ireland, Preliminary Discourse) and some modern authors deny the authenticity of this diploma; and it must be admitted that the absence of the date, no matter what cause may be assigned for it, is a very serious, if not fatal, objection against the genuineness of any public document.

The *real motives*, by which all parties concerned in this affair were actuated, may be best learned from a cursory glance at their transactions.

"The proximity of Ireland to England," writes *Lingard* (Vol. II., ch. 5, A. D. 1154, of his Hist. of England), "and the inferiority of the natives in the art of war, had suggested the idea of *conquest* to both William the Conqueror and the first Henry. The task was seriously taken up by Henry II. The *civilization* of the Irish people and the *reform* of their clergy, was the specious pretext for invading a free and unoffending people. John of Salisbury, a learned monk, and afterward bishop of Chartres, was dispatched to solicit the approbation of Pope Hadrian; 'for,' said he, 'as every Christian island is the property of the Holy See, the king did not presume to make the attempt without the advice and consent of the successor of Peter.' The Pope acquiesced in the project, and signified his willingness that Henry should enter Ireland, and be acknowledged as their lord by the natives. But a strong opposition was made by the Empress Mathilda, Henry's mother, and the barons. Mathilda opposed the project because, as she argued, if the Pope had such plenary powers in the case of Ireland, there was no reason why he should not possess powers equally extensive over England; and to undertake this expedition on his authority, would be to recognize his suzerainty over both countries. As other projects offered themselves to Henry's ambition, the Pope's letter was consigned to the archives of the castle of Winchester, and for the time forgotten."

Fourteen years after this singular negotiation, a few Welsh adventurers landed in Ireland, at the solicitation of one of their native princes. When these Welsh adventurers, under the leadership of *Strongbow*, first sailed to the aid of *Dermot*, Henry viewed the enterprise with contempt, but their subsequent success awakened his jealousy. He commanded the invaders to return, under penalty of forfeiture. Strongbow was alarmed; he satisfied the king by paying him homage, and taking the conquered territory as a fief at his hands. Next month (October 17, 1171), the king landed at Waterford, and received, during a hasty progress, the homage of the neighboring princes. It was his wish rather to allure than to compel submission. But while so many others crowded to Dublin, the pride of O'Connor, the chief king, refused to meet a superior. He condescended, however, to see the royal messengers on the banks of the Shannon, and to make in their presence a *nominal submission*. The princes of Ulster alone obstinately preserved their independence.

The Irish bishops, after the arrival of Henry (November 6), held a *synod at Cashel*, under the presidency of the papal legate, the bishop of Lismore; signed a *formal recognition* of the king's sovereignty, and framed several canons for the reform of their church.

had received the votes of only *three* cardinals,[1] at once assumed the dress proper to one holding the papal dignity, and called himself *Victor IV.*

The king's *nominal sovereignty* was, indeed, over four out of five provinces, but his real authority was confined to the cantreds in the vicinity of his garrisons; there the feudal customs and services were introduced and enforced. In the rest of the island, the national laws prevailed; and the Irish princes felt no other change in their situation, than that they had promised to a distant prince the obedience which they had previously paid to the king of Connaught.

During the war, which afterward ensued between King Henry and his sons, his authority in Ireland was nearly annihilated, and it was during this period of distress that Henry bethought him of the letter which he had formerly procured from Pope Hadrian. It had been forgotten during almost twenty years; now it was drawn from obscurity, was intrusted to William Fitz-Aldhelm, and Nicholas, prior of Walsingford, and was read by them with much solemnity to a synod of Irish bishops, A. D. 1174.

Henry also procured at this time a papal confirmation of Hadrian's grant. "Concessionem ejusdem Adriani super Hibernici regni dominio vobis indulto ratam habemus, et confirmamus: quatemus, eliminatis terrae illius spurcitiis, barbara natio, quae Christiano consetur nomine, vestra indulgentia morum induat venustatem." *Usser.* Syl., epist. III. The next year (1175), O'Connor sent the archbishop of Tuam to Windsor, and a treaty of "*final concord*" was concluded by the ministers of the two princes.

But this papal act, which has been, if not the cause, certainly the occasion of seven centuries of unparalleled *misfortunes* to Ireland, and which was consummated by the concurrent action of an *English* king, an *English* bishop, and an *English* pope, must stand alone on its own merits, be judged by the circumstances of the times, by the principles of public law which then obtained, and by the standards of morality and justice then in vogue. The transfer was entirely a *personal* matter, and whatever of wrong or injustice there was in the act should be laid to the charge of those who gave their sanction to it, on the one hand, and those who executed it, on the other. Popes, being neither prophets nor the sons of prophets, could not peer away into the future, and foresee the stupendous and wide consequences of that one step. But to charge the Roman Church, as such, with arrogance and aggression, because of the Pope's conduct on this occasion, is unfair; and to appeal to the donation of Ireland by Hadrian as an argument against Papal infallibility, is at once a confession of ignorance and the wildest absurdity.

Abbé Darras (Church Hist., Vol. III., p. 260) says that John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres, was commissioned by King Henry to ask the Pope's permission for his royal master to enter and hold Ireland with a view to the restoration of the Christian religion, which was in danger of being extinguished by the influence of "*native idolatry.*" There seems to be a very serious mistake here. No such charge was brought against the Irish. The word "*idolatry,*" that greatest of all sins, does not even occur in Hadrian's bull. (Tr.)

[1] *Meyer*, The election of Alexander III. and Victor IV., etc., Götting. 1871.

On the 4th of September, the great majority of the College of Cardinals gave their votes in favor of Cardinal *Orlando* of Siena,[1] one of the most learned men of his age, formerly a professor of theology at Bologna, and, at the time of his election, Chancellor of the Roman Church. He at first refused to accept the dignity, but finally consented, and was consecrated on the twentieth of the same month, under the name of *Alexander III.* Victor IV. was also consecrated, in the monastery of Farfa, the 4th of October following.

The Emperor convoked a synod, to meet at Pavia (February, A. D. 1160), the purpose of which, he stated, was to decide on the merits of the two claimants of the papacy. The real sentiments of the Emperor were evident, from the manner of address applied to the Pope and the Antipope respectively. Alexander, in the invitation sent to him to attend the synod, was styled "Cardinal Orlando," and Octavian, "Victor, Bishop of Rome." Pope Alexander and his friends, who well understood the real difficulties of their position, refused to submit their cause to the judgment of an assembly completely under the control of the Emperor, and resolved to brave every peril in defense of the liberties of the Church.[2] Conscious that he alone was endowed with the fullness of Apostolic authority, Alexander made use of the following language: "We recognize the Emperor as the protector of the Roman Church, and honor him before all other princes; but a still higher honor is due to the King of kings. Bearing, as we do, a sincere and loyal love to the Emperor, we are not a little surprised that he should refuse a becoming respect to ourselves, to St. Peter, and to the Holy Roman Church. He has written to us and to our brethren that he called to his court, at Pavia, the bishops of the Empire, to provide against a schism in the Church. To convoke a council, and command us to appear before it, is an act unwarranted, either by the usage of his predecessors, or the scope of his authority. The Roman Church, which is above the authority of man, has received from the Lord a commission to try and pass judgment on the affairs of all other churches. . . . Hence, the authority of the canons and the tradition of the Fathers alike forbid us to appear before the imperial court. The most inconsiderable of churches is not so shamefully treated by princes as is the Roman Church at the present time by the Emperor."

---

[1] *Stülz*, Gerhohus of Reichersberg, de investigatione Antichristi et schismate, Archives of sources of Austrian history, Vol. 20, Vienna, 1858. *Tourtual* (Bohemia's share in the struggles of Frederic I., in Italy): I. The Milan war, Götting. 1865; II. The Schism between Alexander III. and Octavian, Münster, 1866.

[2] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist. (Cox's transl.), Vol. IV., p. 12 sq.

In the year 1162, Alexander, to escape the tyranny of the Emperor, sought an asylum in France, and, chiefly through the influence of the Carthusian and Cistercian orders,[1] was generally recognized by the whole Catholic world. King Louis, who took offense at the extravagant demands of Frederic, also declared in his favor, and showed him every mark of respect and reverence.

After the death of Victor, in 1164, Alexander quit France, and returned, by way of Sicily, to Rome.

Frederic, who lost no occasion to persecute the adherents of Alexander, and who used every possible means to secure the recognition of his antipope, attempted to compel the bishops and abbots assembled at the diet of princes, at *Würzburg* (A. D. 1165), to declare for *Paschal III.*, the newly elected antipope (A. D. 1164), and against Alexander. In order to increase his own popularity and that of the contest in which he was engaged, the Emperor had Paschal to commission Archbishop Rainald of Dassel to perform the ceremony of Charlemagne's canonization (December 29, A. D. 1165). But these acts, instead of strengthening, weakened his party, and added to the number of Alexander's adherents. The latter, taking advantage of the growing discontent of the Lombards, and their hatred of *Frederic and his scheme of universal*

---

[1] In *Bolland.* Acta SS., mens. Junii, T. V., c. III., p. 232, it is related: "Quum universa paene anceps ecclesia vacillaret," the order of Carthusians had first given the weight of its influence in favor of Alexander: "Praecedentibus itaque *Cartusiensibus* et *Cisterciensibus* Alexander Papa ecclesiarum in partibus Galliae, Britanniae atque Hispaniae cito meruit obedientiam habere." The well disposed recognized in Alexander the champion of the cause of God—in Victor, the creature of imperial power. Cf. *Thomas à Becket*, ep. 48.

monarchy, concluded an alliance[1] with them, for the purpose of withstanding the imperial pretensions.

The Emperor again marched into Italy, at the head of an army, laid siege to Ancona, which he reduced, after spending twelve months under its walls, by starving the inhabitants, and then marched straight upon Rome, where he proposed that both claimants should resign, and a third be chosen, over whose election he would exercise no influence. Alexander replied to this demand, by again pronouncing sentence of excommunication against him as a persecutor of the Church, and then fled to Benevento (A. D. 1167). Paschal, on the contrary, remained in Rome, and crowned Frederic and his consort Beatrice.

But the day of retribution was drawing near, when he, who had set at naught all rights, human and divine, would be forced to bow before the chastisements of heaven. A pestilential disease broke out in his camp, and in a few days carried off thousands of his army and followers, among whom were the Dukes Guelf and Frederic, Rainald (archbishop of Cologne), and the bishops of Liége, Verdun, Spires, and Ratisbon. At Pavia, whither the poor remains of the plague-stricken army had been led back, Frederic published the ban of the Empire against the confederated cities. On the 1st of December, the cities of the march of Verona—viz., Venice, Piacenza, Parma, Modena, and Bologna—joined the Lombard league; and in March, 1168, Frederic, in an unsuccessful attempt against the Milanese, lost the greater portion of his army, hastened across the Alps, and appeared as a fugitive on the confines of Germany.

Paschal died at the Vatican, in September, 1168, and his adherents at once proceeded to an election of a successor. As there was no schismatical cardinal then alive, they selected Abbot John of Strum, in Hungary, who took the name of Calixtus III., and was immediately acknowledged by Frederic.

---

[1] *Voigt*, History of the Lombard League and its Struggle with Frederic I., Königsberg, 1818.

The Greek emperor, Emmanuel, who was ambitious of having the title of Roman Emperor, sent an embassy to Pope Alexander, who was then at Benevento, with an offer of a large sum of money, and a proposal to reunite the two Churches, if he would confer it upon him. The Pope, after some hesitation, sent back the gold, and refused the request.

The alliance between the Pope and the Lombards grew daily more close and permanent. Between Asti and Pavia, and at the confluence of the Tanaro and the Bormida, the Lombards built a strong fortress, which was intended to serve as a defense against the German emperor, and, out of gratitude to the Pope, named it *Alessandria* (A. D. 1168). In 1170, their consuls transferred this fortress and its lands as tributaries to the Pope and Roman Church. Frederic exerted himself to the utmost, but in vain, to sever this alliance.[1]

He could but ill brook his disgrace, and in the autumn of 1174 led an army into Italy for the fifth time, and sat down before Alessandria. He was compelled to raise the siege by the approach of the allied armies, and at his request negotiations were opened; but as he stubbornly adhered to the articles of the diet of Roncaglia, they were shortly broken off. In May, 1176, he was completely defeated, and his army almost annihilated, by the Lombards, at the battle of *Legnano*. This terrible disaster brought Frederic to his senses, and by the advice of the Bishop of Clermont and the Abbot of Bonneville, he consented, in the *Peace of Venice*[2] (June 24, A. D. 1177), to acknowledge Alexander III. as the true and lawful Pope.

Entering the church of St. Mark's, at Venice, Frederic's heart was touched by the influence of divine grace, and recognizing in his last misfortune the hand of God, he laid aside his imperial robes, and, bowing down, prostrated himself at the feet of the Pope. But Alexander, bending forward, raised him up, and gave him the kiss of peace, after which he celebrated Mass. On the following day, the Pontiff celebrated again, and, when the Emperor entered the church, met him at the door, conducted him to the altar, and gave him Holy Communion. The Emperor then held the stirrup while the Pope mounted his white horse, and, seizing the bridle, conducted him to the palace of the Doges, amid the joyful acclamations of the multitude and the triumphant strains of the *Te Deum*. Peace was solemnly declared on the 11th of August. By the articles of the Treaty of Venice, the Emperor was to enjoy the revenues of the estates of Mathilda for fifteen years, after which a court of arbitrators was to decide to whom they rightfully belonged; an armistice of fifteen years was concluded with William, King of Sicily, and one of six years with the Lombard cities; and, finally, those who had been placed in episcopal sees during the schism of Frederic were permitted to retain them.

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist. (Cox's transl.), Vol. IV., p. 18. (Tr.)

[2] The acts are found in *Baron.* ad a. 1177, nr. 13 sq. More complete in vita Alex. III., by Cardin. Arragon. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. I., p. 467, and Romuald. Chron. (*Murat.*, T. VII., p. 217 sq.) Cf. Alex. III. epp. in *Baron.*, l. c., n. 24–26; *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 178 sq.; *Muratori*, Antiqq., T. IV., p. 275 sq. Anonymous account "de Pace Veneta relatio," in *Pertz*, T. XIX. *Alex. III.* opp. in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 200. Cf. "Alexander III. and Frederic I. at Venice" (Historical and Political Papers, Vol. I., p. 48–56). **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 617–629.

A delegation from Rome requested Alexander to again take up his residence in that city. The assembly of senators at Anagni took the oath of fidelity to him, and made a solemn promise to restore to him all the rights and prerogatives belonging to the Holy See. Calixtus III., the antipope, submitted to the authority of Alexander, and was by him made governor of Benevento.

During the reigns of Henry's predecessors, the clergy of England had, by long custom and ecclesiastical right, become tolerably independent of the State. This was not to Henry's liking, and on the death of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England, he forced his chancellor and personal friend, *Thomas à Becket*,[1] to accept the office. His purpose in this appointment was soon revealed. He at once proposed that all clerics convicted of crime should be deprived of orders, and handed over to the civil tribunals. Henry had mistaken his man. From the moment Thomas became primate, his whole mode of life was entirely changed; he passed from luxury to asceticism, and among the people bore the reputation of a saint. To him ecclesiastical immunities were part of the sacred heritage of the Church, and he never ceased to be their most unyielding champion. But he could not stand alone against the violence and tyranny of Henry, when the Pope advised concession, and the bishops fell from his side. In 1164 he agreed to accept the constitutions, or the concordat between Church and State, which Henry submitted to a council of the orders, lay and spiritual, at *Clarendon.* According to these constitutions,[1] the election of a bishop was to take place before royal officers, in the king's chapel, and with the king's assent; the prelate-elect was bound to do homage for his lands before consecration, and to hold his lands as a barony from the king, subject to all feudal burdens of taxation, and attendance in the king's court; no bishop might leave the realm without the royal permission; no tenant-in-chief, or royal servant, should be excommunicated, or their land placed under interdict, but by the king's assent; it pertained to the king's court to decide whether a suit between a clerk and a layman, whose nature was disputed, belonged to the church's courts or the king's; a royal officer was to be present in all ecclesiastical proceedings, in order to confine the bishop's court within its due limits, and a clerk once convicted there passed under the civil jurisdiction; an appeal was left from the archbishop's court to the king's for defect of justice; the privilege of sanctuary in churches and churchyards was repealed, so far as property, and not persons, was concerned; and, finally, the son of a serf could not be admitted to orders without his lord's permission.[2]

---

[1] The biography by four of his admirers. Quadrilogus de vita S. Thomae, and Epistolae Thomae Cantuar., ed. *Chr. Lupus.*, Bruxelles, 1682, 4to. — *Lingard*, Hist. of England, T. II. †*Buss*, St. Thomas, Archbp. of Canterb., and his Struggle for the Freedom of the Church, Mentz, 1856. *Stolberg-Brischar*, Vol. III. (of the complete work, Vol. 48.)

---

[1] A short Hist. of the Eng. People, by *J. R. Greene, M.A.*, London, 1875, pp. 103, 104. (Tr.)

[2] The Acts of the Assembly and the Sixteen Ordinances, in *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 1187 et sq. *Hefele*, Vol. V., p. 553 et sq. For an appreciation of them, see Dr. Pauli's *Gesch. v. Engl.*

After a most determined resistance, Thomas à Becket finally consented to set his seal to these constitutions; but quickly repenting of his act, and having obtained the Pope's permission to do so, he retracted his assent. Henry now turned upon him with feelings of the most savage resentment. Vexatious and unfounded charges were brought against him in the king's court, and his life being in danger, he was advised to submit. But no danger could daunt him, and, seizing his archiepiscopal cross, he entered the royal court, and appealed from its decision to the Holy See. Shouts of "*Traitor! traitor!*" caught his ear as he retired, and, turning fiercely upon his enemies, he said: "Were I a knight, my sword should answer that foul taunt." At nightfall, he fled in disguise, and made his way through Flanders to France, where he found protection with Louis VII., and a hospitable and honorable reception in the Cistercian monastery of Pontigny, in Burgundy. The Pope constantly gave him evidences of affection and friendship, in spite of the efforts of Henry and a host of enemies to misrepresent him; but entertaining hopes that the quarrel might be amicably settled, he counseled moderation, and instructed the primate not to proceed at once to extreme measures against Henry and his partisans. But when Henry II., in order to carry on his quarrel more successfully, entered into an alliance with the Emperor of Germany, Pope Alexander gave leave to Becket (New Year's, A. D. 1166) to proceed with more rigor against those who were "plundering" the churches of his diocese, and at Easter of the same year made him Apostolic Legate for England.

About Pentecost of this year, Becket published from *Vezelay* a document, threatening with the censures of the Church all who sustained the *Consuetudines regiae*, and adhered to the Constitutions of Clarendon. Many of those against whom this threat was directed, were afterward excommunicated.

By a system of terrorism, Henry endeavored, in the meantime, to force his subjects to submit to his anti-ecclesiastical legislation, and by fraudulent misrepresentation had led the Pope to adopt a temporizing policy, and to inhibit to Thomas à Becket the exercise of his primatial jurisdiction. But he was at length compelled to yield to the demands of the Pope and the Primate, after which the latter, against the advice of his friends, returned to England (A. D. 1170). When he entered Canterbury, the men of Kent flocked around him, and gave him a most enthusiastic welcome.

Becket, after his return, pursued the policy he had always advocated, and carried out his principles with rigorous consistency. Contrary to the general expectation, he at once excommunicated and suspended those bishops who had adhered to Henry, notwithstanding that the Pope had instructed him not to have recourse to this measure, except in extreme cases, and then only with the consent of the King of France.

Henry, who was at this time residing in Normandy, in an outburst of violent passion, was so imprudent as to let fall the following words against Thomas à Becket: "What cowards have I fed? Is there no one who will rid me of this turbulent priest?" Four knights who were present—viz., William Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, Richard Brito, and Reginald Fitzurse—interpreting the king's language as equivalent to a royal license to murder the archbishop, crossed the channel, and having made their way to Canterbury, burst, with loud shouts, into the choir of the cathedral, whither Becket had retired, and murdered him at the foot of the altar (December 29, A. D. 1170).[1]

---

[1] Mr. *J. R. Greene*, in his admirable History of the English People, pp. 104, 105, gives the following description of the scene: "After a stormy parley with him in his chamber, they withdrew to arm, and Thomas was hurried by his clerks into the cathedral. As he reached the steps leading from the transept to the choir, his pursuers burst in shouting from the cloisters. "Where," cried Reginald Fitzurse, in the dusk of the dimly lighted minster, "where is the traitor, Thomas Becket?" The primate turned resolutely back, "Here am I—no traitor, but a priest of God," he replied, and again descending the steps, he placed himself with his back against a pillar, and fronted his foes. All the bravery, the violence of his old knightly life, seemed to revive in Thomas, as he tossed back the threats and demands of his assailants. "You are our prisoner," shouted Fitzurse, and the four knights seized him, to drag him from the church. "Do not touch me, Reginald," shouted the primate; "pander that you are, you owe me fealty;" and, availing himself of his personal strength, he shook him roughly off. "Strike, strike," retorted Fitzurse, and blow after blow struck Thomas to the ground. A retainer of Ranulf de Broc, with the point of his sword, scattered the primate's brains on the ground. "Let us be off," he cried triumphantly. "This traitor will never rise again." (Tr.)

This atrocious murder raised a cry of horror throughout all Europe, and the guilt of the crime was laid to the charge of the English king. During the solemnities of the following Holy Thursday, the Pope excommunicated, in general terms, the primate's assassins, their advisers, abettors, and protectors; and in 1173 the murdered archbishop was canonized as one who, as a martyr in the cause of God, had been honored by the people as a *saint* before his remains had been consigned to their last resting-place. Crowds flocked to his tomb. The wonderful cures wrought by his intercession spread the fame of his sanctity through the whole country, and men of every rank and condition bore testimony to their truth.

The Archbishop, instead of requiring the authority of the Pope to bear testimony to his sanctity, was himself a most potent witness, by his many miracles, to the justice of the Pope's cause. A most uncompromising advocate and defender of ecclesiastical immunities, Thomas à Becket was also a most zealous adherent of the Pope; and now that his miracles bore testimony to the truth of his principles, they were equally effective as an argument in favor of the Holy See.

Henry, who was deeply affected by the primate's death, sought to justify himself before the Pope, and obtain absolution.[1] This was not granted till he had done penance, withdrawn the Constitutions of Clarendon, and agreed to furnish one hundred knights to fight against the infidels. His absolution was pronounced (A. D. 1172) in the cathedral of Avranches.[2]

Thus, while Frederic I. was waging war, and daily augmenting the number of his enemies, Henry II. was making a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Thomas, and conciliating the affections of many who had regarded him with horror.

About this time, Alexander raised *Portugal* to the rank of a kingdom, and conferred the new dignity upon Duke *Alphonso*.

---

[1] Cf. *Neander*, Ch. Hist. (Torrey's transl.), Vol. IV., p. 171; also *John of Salisbury*, eps. 286 and 287. (Tr.)

[2] *Gervasii Cantuar.* Chron. and *Roger de Hoveden*, ad an. 1172, Charta absolutionis regis Henrici. *Hefele*, V., 611.

Finally, to prevent a recurrence of the disorders produced by the late antipopes, Alexander convoked the *Third Lateran*, or

ELEVENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (MARCH, A. D. 1179).

There were present at this council, besides a large number of abbots, three hundred and two bishops, from every country of Europe and from Syria. Twenty-seven canons were passed during its sitting, of which the following is a summary: 1. *A two-thirds vote of the cardinals shall be requisite for the valid election of a Pope*, and if any person presume to assume the office without having obtained the requisite number of suffrages, he and his electors shall be forever cut off from the communion of the Church. This canon was called for by the events of the election of Alexander III. and the antipope Victor. 2. Those ordained by the antipopes Victor IV., Paschal III., and Calixtus III. were declared forever incapable of exercising priestly functions, and titulars appointed by them were deprived of their dignities. 3. One to be eligible to a bishopric must have reached the age of thirty-three years. 4. This canon provides for the payment of expenses incurred in episcopal visitations. 5. Those about to take orders, must be either provided with a benefice, or have a patrimony sufficient for their decent support. 6. As a rule, canonical admonition must precede suspension and excommunication. A specified time must be fixed for the prosecution of appeals, which, if vexatious, are altogether forbidden. 7. All extortions *for* the administration of the sacraments, sepulture, and installation of persons into new dignities, if of the nature of simony, are condemned. 8. Promises of ecclesiastical benefices not yet vacant (*expectativae*) are forbidden. 9. Religious are commanded to pay a proper respect to episcopal authority. 10. No charge is to be exacted of persons entering religion. 11. Clerical incontinency is forbidden, and strangers are prohibited entering female convents. 12. Ecclesiastical causes are not to be brought before secular tribunals. 13. A plurality of benefices may not be held by one person; and personal residence is enjoined. 14. Investiture of ecclesiastical benefices by laymen is prohibited. 15. Persons having ecclesiastical benefices are permitted to dispose of the personal property, in their possession at the time of election, as they may see fit, but not of that accruing from their benefices, which, on their death, reverted to the Church. 16. Decrees of chapters, to be valid, if a two-third vote can not be secured, must have the sanction either of the majority of the collegiate body, or, this failing, the approval of those most distinguished by prudence and virtue. 17. To receive the nomination to a benefice, one must be distinguished by superior merit, and receive a majority of the collegiate vote. 18. This canon requires that masters be provided for the cloister and cathedral schools. 19. This forbids the taxation of church property. 20. Tournaments endangering the life of the participants are interdicted. 21. This canon forbids any violation of the *Truce of God.* 22. This prescribes that the *Truce of God* be kept with priests, clerics, and monks. 23. Lepers shall have their own church, burial-ground, and priest. 24. Renegades from the faith who furnish the Saracens with arms, serve as captains under them, or become pirates, are declared excommunicate. 25. Usurers are to be refused Holy Communion, denied Christian sepulture, and their offerings to be refused. 26. Jews and Saracens are forbidden to keep Christian slaves. In courts of justice, Christians are to be preferred to Jews as witnesses. Converted Jews are to be protected in their rights and property. 27. This canon reads as follows: "*The Church*," says St. Leo the Great, "*while deprecating bloody executions, has a right to call upon temporal princes to vindicate the honor of her laws; and the fear of corporal chastisement has often induced a recourse to spiritual remedies.* Under the name of Cathari and Patarini, the heretics have secured so firm a foothold in Gascony, and in the territory of Albi and Toulouse, that they now rise up in open revolt; while the heretics in Brabant, Aragon, Navarre, and Biscay, the Cotelerii and Triaverdini, respect neither churches nor monasteries, spare neither age nor sex, neither orphans nor widows. They renew all the excesses of the heathens and barbarians. We declare them solemnly excommunicated. We enjoin all the faithful to resist their ravages, and to defend the Christians against their inroads. We grant the usual indulgences, and the forgiveness of their sins, to all who arm for this holy crusade."[1]

§ 220. *Lucius III.* (A. D. 1181–1185)—*Urban III.* (A. D. 1185–1187)—*Gregory VIII.* (A. D. †1187)—*Clement III.* (A. D. 1187–1191)—*Celestine III.* (A. D. 1191–1198)—*Frederic I.*—*Henry VI.*

With the death of Alexander, a season promising fresh troubles seemed to be opening upon the papacy. Frederic, indeed, had been forced to sign the *Treaty of Constance* (1183),[2] which, based upon the Concordat of Worms, granted concessions considerably more ample than those contained in the articles of the *Peace of Venice.* He, moreover, abrogated the enactments of the diet of Roncaglia, and placed the Lombard cities, which he recognized as republics, on an equality with the great vassals of the crown. Always desirous of augmenting the influence of his family by powerful alliances, he had his son, Henry VI., married to the princess *Constance*,[3] who, on the death of William II., without issue, became the sole heiress to the Two Sicilies. By this union, the Pope lost his strongest and most faithful ally, and the house of Hohenstaufen, now in possession of Southern Italy, would, if the imperial and the Italian crowns were worn by one person, become predominant over the whole peninsula.[1] In Germany, the Emperor took up the hereditary feuds of his house with the Guelfs, upon whom he wreaked a most signal vengeance. It was unfortunate that Alexander's successors were not sufficiently powerful to interpose their authority, and put a stop to these unseemly acts of violence. Nor was this all. The Emperor exercised an undue influence in many episcopal elections, and took forcible possession of the inheritance of Mathilda, and the efforts of the Popes Lucius and Urban III., the Milanese, were utterly powerless to prevent him doing either. The old conflict between the Papacy and the Empire had again broken out, and was raging in all its former fierceness, when the pacific Gregory VIII. was called to the papal throne, and all Europe was startled by the intelligence that Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of *Saladin*[2] (October 3, 1187).

---

[1] The acts of this great council in full in *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 209–467. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1673–1775. Cf. *Natal. Alex.* II. E. saec. XII., diss. XI. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., V., 631 sq. — The exposition of canons 2–26 is according to *Palma*, H. E., Vol. II., p. 226–231; of canon 27, according to *Darras*, Vol. III., p. 289. (Tr.)

[2] In the Appendix to the Corpus Juris Civilis, and in *Muratori*, Antiq., T. IV., p. 307.

[3] She was a professed nun, but obtained a papal dispensation to get married. See *Platina's* Life of Celestine III.; cf. *Billuart*, Dissert. IV. de Voto, art. IX.: "Utrum in votis solemnibus Eccl. s. summus pont. possit dispensare," obj. 4, Paris ed. 1857, Vol. VII., p. 298. (Tr.)

In the days of *Baldwin I.*, the brother and successor of Godfrey de Bouillon, suspicion and party feuds had already produced their natural results in the kingdom of Jerusalem; and that king's authority did not extend even over the whole of the countries of Palestine and Syria, which had been among the original conquests of the first Crusaders. While, on the one hand, the relations between the *principalities* of *Antioch*, *Tripolis*, *Tiberias*, and *Edessa* and the kingdom of Jerusalem, were far from being close or satisfactory; on the other, the efforts of the Latins against the common enemy were paralyzed by the internal divisions of the Christian sects, which the crusaders had met in Asia. The *capture of Ascalon*, in 1153, under Baldwin III., was the most important conquest since the first crusade. This city was regarded by many as indispensably necessary to the defense of Jerusalem from the side of Egypt, but the victory was not followed up with the necessary energy to produce any permanent and solid results. Everything seemed to favor the Mohammedans, who were daily growing more bold and aggressive, and to hasten the fall of Jerusalem, which the gallant Templars and the Knights of St. John labored in vain to avert. Saladin, who was already master of Syria and Egypt, was resolved that the Crescent should displace the Cross on the mosque of Omar. Fifty thousand horsemen and a vast army on foot gathered about his standard. He encountered and defeated the Christians at Tiberias (A. D. 1187); entered Berytus, Acre, Caesarea, and Jaffa as a conqueror; pursued his way to Ascalon, which accepted terms of peace, and laid siege to Jerusalem, which, after holding out fourteen days, came to terms, and capitulated.

---

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 22. (Tr.)

[2] i. e. "Splendor of justice," or "religion." (Tr.)

When the news of the fall of Jerusalem reached the West, Europe was stirred to its depths, and the fiery enthusiasm which but a few short years before had seized upon the people, and thronged every road leading to the East with crusaders, broke out afresh, and for the moment absorbed every other interest, and united all parties in the one great scheme of rescuing the Holy City. The Pope and the Emperor were the first to set the example. The appeals of Gregory VIII. and his successor, *Clement III.*, calling for a new crusade,[1] met with a hearty response from every quarter. "Feud and strife," it was said, "must now cease among Christians." The days of Peter the Hermit seemed to have returned. Again every tongue repeated, "It is the will of God; it is the will of God." Whole populations demanded the Cross, and those who were unable to take the field, paid the tax, called the *Saladin tithe*. Even *Frederic*,[2] though far advanced in years, seemed to forget his age and infirmities amid the glow of generous and holy enthusiasm, and, placing himself at the head of a well-disciplined and formidable army, advanced, by way of Ratisbon, through Hungary, and, entering the empire of the Greeks, chastised and humbled their perfidious emperor. But, unfortunately, the leader, who promised so much, was soon to pass away. Frederic was drowned, June 10, 1190—according to some, while crossing; according to others, while bathing—in the river Calycadnus, or Saleph, in Cilicia. Frederic, Duke of Suabia, his son, upon whom the command of the army now devolved, was carried away by pestilence, together with nearly all his followers, at the siege of Acre, or Ptolemais.

---

[1] Ad omnes fideles de clade Hierosolymitana. *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 527 sq. *Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1889 sq.

[2] *Tageno* (Decan. eccl. Patav., who was engaged in the Second Crusade), Descript. exped. Asiat. Friderici (*Freher-Struve*, T. I., p. 405). *Ansberti*, Hist. de expedit. Frider., ed. Dobrowsky, Prag. 1827. *Rietzler*, The Crusade of Frederic I., 1870.

Richard Coeur de Leon, King of England, and *Philip Augustus*, King of France, had gone by sea to Palestine, during the summer of 1190.[1] Owing to the jealousies and the quarrels of the leaders, the combined forces of the Christians were able to effect no more than the *reduction of Acre* (July 13, 1191). Philip returned to France immediately after the capture of the city; and the English king was also shortly obliged to quit Palestine, but not, however, until he had concluded with Saladin an armistice (A. D. 1192) of three years, which secured to the Christians, besides Antioch and Tripolis, the possession of the tract of country lying between Tyre and Jaffa, and obtained for pilgrims the right of entering Jerusalem untaxed and unmolested.

On his way home, Richard was made prisoner by Leopold, Duke of Austria,[2] who delivered him into the hands of *Henry VI.* of Germany. The Pope endeavored in vain to secure the freedom of the gallant crusader, which was obtained only after the payment of a heavy ransom.[1]

---

[1] *Galfridi de Vino Salvo* († after 1245), Itinerarium Richard. in terram sanctam. (*Bongars.*, T. I., and *Gale*, Scriptt. hist. Angl., T. II.) *Rigordius Gothus*, de Gest. Phil. Aug. (*du Chesne*, T. V.; *Bouquet.*, T. XVII.) Cf. *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Univ. Hist., Vol. VII., p. 81 sq. *Raumer*, Vol. II., p. 319 sq.

[2] As the haughty bearing of Richard had caused the hasty return of Philip Augustus after the fall of Acre, so also had it given a most unpardonable affront to Leopold on the same occasion. Leopold had been in the very thick of the fight, and so desperately did the battle rage about him, that, when it was over, he found his coat of mail completely covered with blood, except where protected by a girdle encircling his loins. Hence, the Austrian escutcheon bears the proud arms of a red ground and white fesse. Leopold naturally enough thought he had a right to place the standard of Austria on the battlements of the captured city, which, when Richard beheld it, he ordered to be torn down, and dragged in the mire, and refused to give any satisfaction for the affront. It was now Leopold's turn to dictate. *Tschisckka*, Hist. of Vienna, p. 71. (Tr.)

In 1189, when Henry VI. was on his way to Italy to take possession of the Two Sicilies, which became the heritage of his wife Constance, on the death of her uncle, William II., he received the tidings of his father's death. The Sicilians, dreading the rule of a stranger, chose as their king Tancred, Count of Lecce, the natural son of Roger the Elder, who at once received investiture from Pope *Clement III.* He died in 1194, and the Two Sicilies submitted to Henry. The whole policy of this cruel and vindictive king, now in the full vigor of manhood and at the height of his power, seemed to augur ill for the peace of the octogenarian and pacific pontiff, Celestine (A. D. 1191–1198).

The assassination of the Bishop of Liége, and Henry's shameless sale of that bishopric; his disgraceful venality in the case of Richard Coeur de Lion; his prohibition of the clergy and laity of Italy to carry appeals to Rome, and other deeds equally tyrannous and cruel,[2] foreboded a season of unusual danger and trial, when events, beyond human foresight and control, changed the whole aspect of affairs. Henry had scarcely secured the succession of the Germanic crown to his son *Frederic II.*, then only three years of age, but as yet unbaptized, when, in the midst of preparations for a new crusade, he died suddenly, at Messina (A. D. 1197).

Just at this time, one of the greatest men that ever sat upon the papal throne was elected Pope.

§ 221. *Innocent III.—His Relations to the Princes of Europe.*

Innoc. III. Epp., libb. XIX., ed. *Baluz.*, Par., 2 T., f. (lib. 1, 2, 5, 10–16), in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 214–217. *Brequigny* et *de la Porte du Theil*, Diplomata, chartae, epp. et alia docum. ad res Franc. spectantia, Par. 1791, 2 T. (lib. 3 and 5–10.) *Registrum Innoc. III.* super negotia Rom. Imp. (*Baluz.*, T. I., p. 687.) *Gesta Innoc. III.*, by a contemporary (ibid. and *Brequigny*, T. I.) *Richardi de St. Germano*, reg. Sicil. notarii, chron. from 1189–1243 (*Muratori*, T. VII.)

**Hurter*, History of Pope Innocent III. and his Contemporaries, Hamburg,

---

[1] *Baron.* ad an. 1193, nro. 2 sq. *Matthaeus Paris.* ad an. 1195. See *Schmidt*, Hist. of the Germans, Pt. II., p. 604 sq.

[2] *Jäjer*, Hist. of Emperor Henry VI. — *Raumer*, Vol. II. *Hefele*, V., 673.

1834–42, 4 vols.; French transl., by *Saint-Cheron.*, Paris, 1838, 3 vols.; same work, transl. by Abbé *Jager* and *Théod. Vial.*, Paris, Vaton Gaume, 1838–40, 2 vols. in 8vo. — *Gregorovius*, Hist. of the City of Rome during the Middle Ages, Vol. V. *Von Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II., p. 466 sq. *Stolberg-Brischar*, Vol. 50. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., V. 697–810.

Innocent was sprung from the illustrious Italian family of the Conti, and had diligently cultivated his eminent gifts and talents, by the study of theology and law, at the schools of Paris, Rome, and Bologna.

He had been created cardinal-deacon in 1190 by his uncle Clement III., and intrusted with the management of most important affairs; but when Celestine became Pope, he was deprived of these dignities, probably on account of some family feud, and in his retirement composed an ascetical and a liturgical work of merit, which are still much esteemed. These are entitled, respectively, "*On the Contempt of the World*" (*De Contemptu Mundi*) and "*On the Sacrifice of the Mass*" (*De Sacrificio Missae*). His title as cardinal was Lothario of Anagni, and at the time of his election (A. D. 1198) he was only thirty-seven years of age. His extreme youth caused the German poet, Walter von der Vogelweide, to cry out, "Woe to us! we have a stripling for a Pope. O Lord! have mercy on Christendom."[1]

His first thoughts were directed to *the reformation of the papal court; the restoration of the Pope's temporal power;* the deliverance of Italy from the rule of the stranger; the separation of the Two Sicilies from Germany, which he regarded as an essential condition to the independence of the Church; and to making the influence of the Head of the Church, whose authority, as he said, is related to that of princes as the *sun* to the *moon*, felt throughout the length and breadth of Christendom.[2] "The papacy," said he, writing to Otho,

---

[1] "O we der babst ist ze junc, hilf Herre diner Kristenheit." P. 9, in Lachmann's ed., V. 35. (Tr.)

[2] This idea, which had already been expressed by Gregory VII. (lib. VII., ep. 25 ad Gulielmum regem Angliae, A. D. 1085), was still more emphatically reaffirmed by Innocent (lib. I., ep. 401 ad Acervum). Cf. supra, p. 599, note 1. Although Innocent spoke energetically in this instance, he was nevertheless careful never to overstep the limits of his authority. Relative to his office of mediator between the French and English kings, he spoke as follows, following

"has a preëminence over royalty. The authority of the latter is exercised on earth and over the bodies of men; that of the former in Heaven, and affects their souls. Kings rule over particular countries, provinces, and lords; but Peter is superior to them all in power, and enjoys the fullness of authority, inasmuch as he is the Vicar of Him who has the supreme dominion of the world." No one, however, appreciated more keenly or fully than Innocent the blessings of a sincere and enduring union between Church and State. "For," said he, "through this union is the faith propagated, heresy extirpated, virtue made to flourish, vices rooted out, justice preserved, iniquity held in check, peace secured, persecution abolished, and pagan barbarity subdued. It insures the prosperity of the Empire and the liberty of the Church, is an earnest of bodily security and the salvation of the soul, and guarantees the rights of the clergy and those of the State."

At the opening of his reign, Innocent restored the papal supremacy in Rome, by obliging the imperial prefect, upon whom he himself conferred investiture, to take the oath of fidelity. He also reëstablished the office of senator; took the Lombard league under his protection; concluded an alliance with the Tuscan cities, which he formed into a league subordinated to papal authority, and thus provided at once for their own freedom, and the defense of the Church against the aggressions of the Emperor. In this way, he regained the possessions which had been wrested from the Church by Henry VI.

Constance, before her death, which occurred November 27, A. D. 1198, shortly after that of her husband Henry VI., sent an embassy to the Pope, and obtained from him the feudal grant of Sicily, Apulia, and Capua, for her young son Frederic II. Innocent, who had learned from the history of his predecessors the evil effect of permitting the kings of Sicily to enjoy extensive ecclesiastical power, wisely insisted, as a condition of this grant, on a surrender of the privileges wrung

---

the teaching laid down in Matt. xviii. 15–17, Ad praelatos Franciae (Decretalium Greg. IX., lib. II., tit. I., c. 13): "Non enim intendimus judicare de feudo — sed decernere de peccato, cujus ad nos pertinet sine dubitatione censura, quam in quemlibet exercere possumus et debemus," etc. Then he appeals to Emperor Valentinian. Cf. below, p. 624, n.1.

from Hadrian IV. These were the prerogatives of what was styled the *Sicilian Monarchy*, and were numerous and important, embracing legatine powers, the right of the king to appoint to bishoprics, to receive appeals, and to grant or refuse, at his pleasure, permission to bishops to attend councils. The high regard entertained for the Pope by Constance, and the great confidence she reposed in him, induced her, when dying, to make him guardian of her young son, and to place the regency of Sicily in his hands. The ability displayed by Innocent in the administration of the government of Sicily during the minority of Frederic, and the pains he was at to give the young prince an education suited to his high destiny, fully justified the trust placed in him by Constance.[1]

Frederic II. had been recognized as emperor while yet a child, and even *before he was baptized;* but to govern Germany at that time, required a man possessed of energy and ability. Moreover, both the Pope and the German nobles were averse to see so many crowns united on the one head, and a new election was in consequence determined upon. This gave occasion to the revival of the fierce hereditary feuds of the Guelfs and Ghibellines,[2] as each party was desirous to secure the success of its own candidate. The Guelfs elected *Otho IV.*, son of Henry the Lion, and the Ghibellines *Philip of Suabia*, the uncle of young Frederic. Otho was crowned in 1198, at Aix-la-Chapelle, by the archbishop of Cologne, and declared emperor in 1201 by Pope Innocent. But the party of Philip was daily on the increase, and in 1207 his authority was so generally recognized throughout Germany, that Innocent, out of regard for the popular wish, thought of reversing his former judgment, and had in fact made preparations to do so, when, in 1208, Philip was murdered by the count-palatine,

---

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*. Ch. Hist. (Cox's transl.), Vol. IV., p. 27. (Tr.)

[2] The names Welfs (Guelfs) and Waïblingers (Ghibellines) were used for the first time at the battle of Weinsberg, in Suabia (A. D. 1140). The knights on either side, dashing forward to the attack, cried out: "*Strike for the Welfs!*" "*Strike for the Waïblingers!*" These battle-cries were appropriated and retained for centuries in Italy by the papal and the imperial parties—Guelfs being the designation of the party representing the Pope and the free cities, and Ghibellines that of the Emperor. (Tr.)

Otho of Wittlesbach, to whom he had given personal affront. The Pope and all Germany expressed the utmost indignation at the foul deed.

Otho, being now without a rival, married Beatrice, the daughter of Philip, and was crowned emperor, at Rome, in 1209. Before receiving the crown, he promised to grant freedom of ecclesiastical elections, to recognize the right of appeal to Rome, and to secure the Roman Church in all her possessions. But the crown was barely settled on his head, when he laid claim to all sorts of fictitious rights in Italy, and set at defiance a threat of excommunication with which the Pope menaced him, and which he was finally obliged to carry into effect (A. D. 1211).

At a diet of princes, held in Nuremberg, Otho was said to have forfeited the throne, and Innocent now declared in favor of young Frederic II. (A. D. 1212), requiring the usual conditions, however—viz., that he should resign the crown of Sicily as soon after obtaining the imperial crown as a son should be born to him, and that he should organize a crusade before the expiration of three years. He was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1215.

When the ban of the Church fell upon Otho IV., he was deserted by his former adherents, and his authority and possessions were restricted to his hereditary duchy of Brunswick.

The authority of Innocent was at this time respected in every other country of Europe, as well as Germany. He laid *France* under interdict; suspending the administration of the sacraments, except extreme unction, baptism of children, and the confession of those in danger of death, and thus forced Philip Augustus to take back Ingelberga (Ingeburgis), his lawful wife and queen, whom he had repudiated.

In Spain, he compelled *Alphonso IX.*, *King of Leon*, to break off the marriage he had contracted with his niece: and summoned *Peter II. of Aragon* to Rome, to whom he gave the crown, only after the payment of annual tribute had been promised.

He made *Sancho I.*, *King of Portugal*, who had neglected to pay the annual tribute, promised by his father Alphonso to Pope Lucius II., and who had ill treated the Bishop of Porto, place his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See.

In *Poland*, he defended the claims of Leszek the White against Ladislaus Laskonogi, citing, in defense of his position, the law of succession promulgated by Duke Boleslaus III. (*Krzywousty*). He also did much to regenerate the clergy, many of whom were living as married men, and to sustain the efforts of the severe and good archbishop, *Henry of Gnesen*, in the same direction. This holy man, having incurred the displeasure of Ladislaus, who was constantly trenching upon ecclesiastical rights, fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by the Pope, who, having threatened the duke with excommunication, appointed the archbishop papal legate, and sent him back again to his own country.[1]

In *Hungary*, he acted as arbitrator between the two brothers *Emmeric* and *Andrew*, whose difficulties he adjusted. He received the submission of *Vulcan*, prince of *Dalmatia;* and both the prince of the Bulgarians and Wallachians, and Primislas, Duke of Bohemia, received their crowns at his hands.

In *Norway*, where Philip, a representative of the ancient royal line, and *Inge* were contending for the crown, being appealed to by the latter to give judgment between him and his rival, Innocent suspended his decision until he could receive fuller information, for which he applied to the archbishop of Drontheim.

In England, King John desired to raise money to prosecute a French war, for the recovery of his lost dominions. He had assembled an army at Portsmouth, in the summer of 1205; but his plans were suddenly frustrated, by the resolute opposition of the Primate and Earl Mareschal. The death of the primate, Hubert Walter, a few days later, seemed to open to King John a way out of the difficulty. He determined to place in the see of Canterbury, John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, a man entirely devoted to his interests, and accordingly ordered the monks to elect him, and had him enthroned in his presence. But as the junior part of the monks of Christ Church had already elected Reginald, their sub-prior, archbishop, there were now two claimants to the see. Both sent embassies to Rome to plead their respective causes before Innocent III., by whom the respective claims of both were set aside. This decision had been foreseen; and as King John desired by all means to have the Bishop of Norwich elevated to the primatial see of Canterbury, he had taken the precaution to send a messenger with an offer to the Pope of three thousand marks, if he would yield to the royal wish. Innocent indignantly rejected the bribe, and refused to change what he had done. He ordered the canons of both parties, then in Rome, to proceed at once to an election, and recommended to their choice *Stephen Langton*, an Englishman of eminence, then residing in the city, who had taught, with applause, in the schools of Paris, and been successively made chancellor of the University and cardinal of the Church. The monks gave him their suffrages, and, after waiting a decent length of time, but to no purpose, for the royal approbation, the Pope himself consecrated the new archbishop at Viterbo, July 17th. The king obstinately refused to recognize Langton, and, in reply to the Pope's threats of interdict if the archbishop were longer excluded from his see, said that if the interdict were fulminated, he would banish the clergy, and mutilate every Italian he could seize in the realm. He would never allow Langton to set his foot in England as primate. But Innocent was not a man to be deterred when duty was in question, and in 1208 he issued the interdict. The Pope allowed two years more to elapse before formally cutting John off from the communion of the Church; but the king met the sentence as defiantly as of old. His pretensions to superiority over the king of the Scots, and his triumphs in Ireland, shed a temporary luster about his waning cause.

---

[1] Cf. *Hurter*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 136–142. For the history of the Church in Poland during this epoch, is important: *Starovolscii* Historia conciliorum tam generalium quam provincialium praecipuorum in Polonia, lib. XXVI., Romae, 1653. The council, held in 1181, under *Alexander III.*, is here given as the first of Poland. *Mansi's* account is taken from the same source. *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 581 *Conc. Lanciciense*, A. D. 1188, and further on, p. 589. *Conc. Cracoviense*, A. D. 1199.

John, notwithstanding his defiant attitude, grew uneasy. He knew the practical effect of excommunication was to release his subjects from their oaths of fealty, and that if his deposition were proposed, his old enemy, Philip Augustus of France, would be only too glad to have an opportunity of carrying it into effect. In 1212, Innocent formally absolved John's subjects from their oaths, and called upon Christian princes and barons to depose him, and elect another in his stead. John made ample and vigorous preparations to repel the invaders. "He might," says the historian, "have defied all the powers of Europe with his powerful army had his men been animated with love for their sovereign;" but throughout the whole of his reign he had done everything to irritate, and little to conciliate. his subjects. His arrogance, his tyranny, and his insolence had alienated the hearts of all, and it was this fear of danger and disaffection at home, more than any demonstrations on the other side of the channel, that brought him to terms with the Pope. While John was under the influence of these fears, he was visited by Pandulf, the confidential agent of the Pope, and was by him persuaded to put his signature to an instrument which but a short time before he had indignantly rejected. By this he agreed to admit the Archbishop of Canterbury to his see; to recall all exiles, and to liberate all prisoners on whom sentence had been passed by reason of their adherence to the Pope, and to fully compensate the clergy for their losses. Nor was this all. He solemnly resigned his crown and his realms into the hands of the papal legate; received them back again, to be held by fealty and homage as a vassal of the Pope, and agreed to pay to the Holy See an annual rental of one thousand marks. This transaction has covered the memory of John with disgrace, and attached to his name the most opprobrious epithets, and among them that of *Lackland.* The act can certainly not be commended; but when it is considered, on the one hand, that John was solicitous for his crown, and, on the other, that the barons consented to it from a wish to humble the king's insolence and pride, we shall understand that he was not so much to blame, and that they had made a profitable conquest. From this time forward, they stubbornly insisted on their rights and liberties. The Roman Pontiff, who had all along supported the cause of the Primate and the barons, now threw the weight of his influence in favor of the king. The interdict was removed in December, 1213.

The battle of *Bouvines*, between Lille and Tournay, fought July 27, 1214, was fatal to the prospects of John, and flattering to the vanity of Philip. John returned humiliated, from an inglorious contest in France, to one still more inglorious in England. Seeing that the barons were all leagued against him, he sought to conciliate the good-will of the clergy, by granting freedom of canonical election (February 2, 1215), and taking the cross.

The contest between the king and the barons for the liberties of England, as is generally supposed, was now fairly opened. Both parties appealed to the Pope as their feudal superior. Innocent, in his reply, counseled moderation. The barons persisted in their demands. The king proposed to settle matters by arbitration; his proposal was rejected. Their leader was Stephen Langton the Primate, whom Innocent had appointed to the see of Canterbury. "From the moment he landed in England," says Mr. Greene, "he assumed the constitutional position of the Primate as champion of the old English customs and law against the personal despotism of the kings." The barons, under the lead of Fitz-Walter, formed themselves into an organization, which they called "the army of God and of Holy Church," levied war against the king, took Bedford, and surprised London. On the 15th of July, a meeting took place on an island of the Thames, between Staines and Windsor, between the delegates of the king and those of the barons. The latter, acting under counsel of the primate, Stephen Langton, extorted the *Great Charter* (*Magna Charta Libertatum*) from King John, which was "discussed, agreed to, and signed in a single day."[1] The charter was far from being an entirely new instrument; it did no more than correct the feudal abuses introduced by the Normans, and secure the ancient liberties of the people. It restored to the *clergy* the full exercise of their liberties—freedom of election, exemption from secular jurisdiction, and the right of appeal to the Holy See in all ecclesiastical matters. But for all this, Innocent annulled the Great Charter, because the barons, in wresting it from the king, had violated their oaths of fealty and his right of suzerainty. He commanded them to yield obedience to their king; promised to redress their grievances and their wrongs, and held a menace of excommunication over such as would not submit.

---

[1] Cf. *Lingard*, Hist. of Eng., Vol. III., p. 14–50, London and New York, 1848; also *J. R. Greene*, Short Hist. of the Eng. People, p. 118–127, London, 1875. The text of the charter is given in *Cantù*, Univ. Hist., Vol. VII., p. 587–604. (Tr.)

Finally, even *Constantinople* recognized, or was forced to feel, the weight of Innocent's authority. But here it was rather detrimental than favorable to the project, always dear to his heart, of liberating the holy places.[1] The crusade which the great preacher, *Fulco*, *Curate of Neuilly*, had set on foot, was diverted from its legitimate aim by the dishonorable conduct of *Henry Dandolo*, Doge of Venice. This shrewd old man, already white with the honorable crown of age, physically blind, but gifted with a marvelous clearness of mental vision, learning that the crusaders were unable to pay for the outfit of a fleet and their transportation, and, taking advantage of their embarrassments, prevailed upon them, in spite of the menaces of the Pope, to undertake the conquest of the city of Zara, in Dalmatia, which, being constantly in rebellion, was a source of no little solicitude to Venice. These crusaders also allowed themselves to be drawn by the fugitive emperor Alexius into the court-quarrels of the Greek Empire. After encountering innumerable difficulties, they entered Constantinople, April 12, 1203, and founded the Latin Empire, with Baldwin, Count of Flanders, as its first emperor. It lasted from 1203 to 1261.[2] Innocent complained that the crusaders, instead of directing their efforts against the infidel, spent their energies in dethroning Christian princes. He pronounced sentence of excommunication against them, but withdrew it again, and granted them absolution, in consideration of the exceptional difficulties of their position, and in the hope of deriving profit to the Church from his moderation. He was invited to come to Constantinople, but declined.

---

[1] *Hefele*, The Crusade under Innocent III. (Supplements to Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 316 sq.)

[2] Cf. Balduini ep. ad Ottonem imp., in *Arnoldi* Chronic. Slav., lib. VI., c. 19, and Balduini ep. ad omnes fideles, in *Arnold.*, l. c., cap. 20, in another sense, ad Innoc. (Innoc., lib. VII., epist. 152, and in *Raynaldi* annal. ad a. 1204, nr. 6–18.) *Geoffroy de Ville-Hardouin*, de la Conqueste de Constantinople, from the year 1198–1207 (l'histoire de l'empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs Franc., par *C. du Fresne*, Ven. 1729, f.) *Nicetas Acominatus*, Hist. by Joan. Comnen. Imperat. to Bald. Flander. 1117–1206, ed. *Fabroti*, Paris, 1647, f. Cf. *Damberger*, Vol. IX., p. 489–513. *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Univ. Hist., Vol. VII., p. 169 sq *Raumer*, Vol. III., p. 198–236.

Such was the energy, the activity, and the influence of Innocent, that he was always prepared to come to the relief of the oppressed, and was always present, when needed, in any quarter of Christendom, either personally or by his legates. But, in the midst of affairs so numerous and distracting, Innocent never lost sight of the one great object he had in view. He convoked the Fourth Lateran, or

TWELFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 1215).

This was beyond all comparison the most imposing council[1] yet held in the Church. Both East and West were represented. There were present seventy-one primates and archbishops, four hundred and twelve bishops, and eight hundred priors and abbots. The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch sent their representatives, and those of Jerusalem and Constantinople came in person. There was a host of deputies from collegiate churches and chapters, and embassadors representing, besides the emperors of Germany and Constantinople, every prince in Christendom. It would seem that all the culture, the science, and the learning of the civilized world had their representatives assembled there, under the presidency of the ablest and the wisest of Roman Pontiffs.

The council held *three* sessions, in which the chief subject of discussion was the project of organizing a new crusade. The Pope, when informed of the singular phenomenon, known as the *Children's Crusade*, cried out, with a groan: "These children put us to shame; while we are buried in sleep, they are courageously flying to the defense of the Holy Land."[2] To insure the success of the new crusade, it was enacted that the *Peace of God* should be kept among Christian princes for an interval of five years, and bishops were instructed to reconcile contending parties. A project of *union* with the *Greek Church* was submitted, and discussed;[3] the *purity and integrity* of the faith were provided for; and the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, which Berengarius had attacked, was accurately defined. In the exposition of the doctrine, as given by the council, we find the word *transubstantiation* (*transsubstantiatio*)[1] used for the first time. The dangerous errors propagated by the abbot *Joachim*, by *Amalric* of Bena, and by the *Albigenses*, and others equally detestable, if not so well known, were condemned. The council put an end to the contest for the German crown, by deciding in favor of Frederic. Finally, it enacted seventy canons concerning clerical life and ecclesiastical discipline, which unfortunately were not generally observed.

---

[1] The Acts in *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 953 sq. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1-86. *Hurter*, Vol. II., p. 633 sq. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 777 sq.

[2] Cf. *Hurter*, Vol. II., p. 452 sq. *Bonn Periodical*, n. 22, p. 209-215.

[3] The Greeks accepted the formula: "Pater *a* nullo, Filius autem a solo Patre ac Spiritus St. *ab utroque pariter* absque initio semper ac sine fine."

By the *third* canon of this council, all heretics cut off from the communion of the Church were made amenable to civil tribunals. and liable to the punishment prescribed by state for the guilt of heresy; but if ecclesiastics. they must be first degraded from their orders.

By the *fifth*, the order of precedence was assigned to the various patriarchates. After Rome came Constantinople, next Alexandria. next Antioch, and finally Jerusalem. It was further enacted that the patriarch should have attached to his pallium the right of erecting crosses in monasteries, thus subjecting them to his jurisdiction. and of receiving appeals.

By the *sixth*, it was prescribed that provincial councils should be held yearly.

The *twenty-first* condemned those sectaries who contemned the *Sacraments of the Church*, and commanded, under penalty of being cut off from the fellowship of the Church, the faithful of both sexes to receive the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist at least once in the year, and the latter sacrament at Easter.[2]

The numerous labors of Innocent called for so much of his time and attention, that he frequently complained of being unable, from press of business, to give himself up to the consideration of heavenly things. But for all this, he did not neglect the spiritual affairs of his office. He preached frequently to both the clergy and the laity—to the former, usually in Latin, and to the latter, in the vulgar tongue. His sermons are not unlike those of Leo the Great, rich in imagery and allegory, and abounding in mystical allusions and startling antitheses. The language, which is admirably suited to the depth and earnest thought of the orator, is graceful, grave, and energetic throughout. The earnestness of his religious feeling and the contemplative character of his mind, are fully attested by the little work, "*On Contempt of the World*,"[1] written by him while he was yet a cardinal.

---

[1] Una vera est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur; *transsubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate Divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro (*Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 981; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 17); concerning Joachim and Amalric, ibidem, c. II.

[2] Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem *semel in anno* proprio sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi poenitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiae sacramentum. (Can. XXI.) "Nam in prima Ecclesia," says *Peter* of *Blois*, a writer who flourished between A. D. 1160 and 1200, "quotquot intererant consecrationi Eucharistiae, communicabant eidem: postquam autem crevit numerus fidelium, nec omnes accedere ad Eucharistiam visum est, statutum est, ut saltem diebus dominicis fideles communicarent. Cum vero paleae succrescentes coeperunt cooperire granum, et multorum refriguit charitas, decretum est, ut saltem per *tres* solemnitates in anno fideles communicarent in Paschate, Pentecoste, et Natali: Nunc autem quia dies mali sunt, et omnes fere declinaverunt, non audeo dicere ex praecepto Ecclesiae, sed ex tacita permissione introductum est, ut *semel* in anno congregentur in Ecclesia ad communicandum; quod praeterire fas non est." (*Palma*, h. e., Vol. II., p. 333; for the canons, p. 317–333.) (Tr.)

Innocent III. united in himself the three qualities which his illustrious predecessor, Alexander III., required in a pope—viz., zeal in preaching, capacity for ecclesiastical government, and prudence in the care of souls. He was benevolent and charitable toward the poor and the widow; generous toward the crusaders, and displayed the most disinterested devotion in reconciling peoples and cities, and calling upon them, in the name of the Lord, to put aside their feuds and live in peace. He was, in fact, on his way to make peace between the cities of Pisa and Genoa, when he died (July 16, A. D. 1216).

If Innocent, like Gregory VII. and Alexander III., to whom he was eminently superior in capacity for business, and in knowledge of law and theology, had had an occasion to display his talents in difficult and trying circumstances, he would unquestionably have proved himself the greatest Pope that sat on the papal throne from the days of St. Peter to his own. And as it was, no pope ever gained for the Holy See a greater measure of influence and authority. Neither is it likely that any pope has had a deeper sense of the responsibilities, or a more exalted idea of the office of the papacy; nor has any other pope ever shown so deep an insight into human affairs, or an equal grasp of the manifold and varied relations of the world, of human thought, passion, and prejudice. One of his latest biographers, the impartial *Hurter*, in the following picture, gives some idea of the light in which this great Pontiff viewed the office of the papacy and his own mission: "In his eyes," says this writer, "the papacy was the only power competent to check the insolence of brute force, and the violation of laws, human and divine. It was a power higher and holier than any political or civil tribunal; a power gentle in instructing and kind in admonition, standing forth against the great of the earth, defending the weak and the oppressed from the violence of the tyrannous and the strong, and protesting against reducing a freeman to the condition of servitude; a power compelling princes to permit widows and orphans to carry their causes before free and impartial ecclesiastical courts; treating with kings as a father might with his children, now praying, now warning, now menacing, and now counseling them to consider the responsibility and the dignity of their office; a power whose greatest glory consists in being the defender of the oppressed; which watches over the morals of the wealthy, reminding them that their pride must not lead them to fancy themselves above all law and authority; which shields the weak and unfortunate against the cupidity of the great and the powerful, and the people against the aggressions of arbitrary and despotic princes which civilizes nations, and, in the assurance of eternal salvation, brings comfort to the heart of man; a power, in fine, which, by its very nature and character, authorizes those who wield it to say truthfully that they have but one weight and one measure for all, and to carry themselves toward those upon whom society has put its brand as toward all other Christians."[1]

---

[1] De Contemptu Mundi s. de Miseria Conditionis Humanae, libb. III., ed. *Achterfeld*, Bonnae, 1855.

§ 222. *Honorius III.* (A. D. 1216–1227)—*Gregory IX.* (A. D. 1227–1241)—*Innocent IV.* (A. D. 1243–1254)—*Alexander IV.* (A. D. 1254–1261)—*Urban IV.* (A. D. 1261–1264)—*Clement IV.* (A. D. 1265–1268), *and the Hohenstaufens, Frederic II., Conrad IV., and Conradin.*

I. *Petri de Vineis* (cancellar. Frid. II. †1249) Epp., lib. VI., ed. *Iselon.*, Basil. 1740, 2 T. Regesta Honor. III. et Greg. IX., in *Raynald. Riccardi* de S. German. Chronic. 1189–1242 (*Muratori*, T. VII.), continued by *Nicol. de Jamsilla*, Hist. de Reb. gestis Frider. II. ejusque filiorum Conradi et Manfredi to 1258 (ibid., T. VIII.) *Pipini* et *Monachi Paduens.* Chron. (ibid., T. VIII. et IX.) *Historia diplomatica Friderici II., collegit et notis illustravit, *Huillard-Bréholles*, Par. 1853, etc., in several volumes.

---

[1] *Hurter*, Pope Innocent III., Vol. III., pp. 74, 75; cf. also p. 69.

II. *Schwarzhueber*, de Celebri inter sacerdotium et imper. schismate temp. Frid. II. diss. hist., Salisb. 1771. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. III., p. 311 sq., and Vol. IV. *W. Zimmermann*, the Hohenstaufens, Pt. II. *Höfler*, the Hohenstaufen, Frederic II., Munich, 1844. *Damberger*, Vol. X. *Schirrmacher*, Emperor Frederic II., Götting. 1859–1865, 4 vols. *Leo*, Lectures on the Hist. of the German Nation, Vol. III.

Frederic II. was far from realizing the high hopes Innocent had entertained of his ward, or from making good, by any corresponding acts of gratitude, his words, when he solemnly declared that "he owed whatever he possessed to the *Holy See*." When fairly seated upon the imperial throne, he inaugurated the favorite policy of his predecessors, by seeking to raise the omnipotence of state-power and absolutism upon the ruins of ecclesiastical rights and municipal liberties. But he could not at once accomplish his purpose. On his way to Rome, in 1220, to receive the imperial crown, he found the gates of Milan closed against him; and when he had arrived at the Eternal City, he was refused coronation until he had sworn to abolish all laws prejudicial to the liberties of the Church; to cede Sicily to his son Henry, to be held as a fief of the Holy See, and not of the Empire; to restore the inheritance of Mathilda, and to undertake a new crusade. He was crowned in St. Peter's church, November 22, 1220, and, visiting Sicily shortly after, deposed some bishops and conferred investiture upon others, thus again reviving the old quarrel between the Empire and the Papacy.

In the meantime, information reached Europe that Saladin had taken Damietta (September 8, 1221), the key to Egypt. Honorius complained that the Christians had sustained this loss because of the tardiness of Frederic, who had culpably put off the promised crusade. The latter gave excuses, and at a meeting between himself and the Pope, at Veroli, in April, 1222, agreed to depart with an army, for the recovery of the Holy Land, within the coming two years. They next met at Ferentino, in March, 1223, where it was agreed that the departure of the expedition should be deferred two years more, and that Frederic, now a widower, should marry *Iolanthe*, daughter of John of Brienne, titular king of Jerusalem—a circumstance which it was thought would be a fresh inducement to the Emperor to save that kingdom.

It was, however, found impossible or inconvenient to make the necessary preparations within the specified time, and a new agreement was made at San Germano, in July, 1225, by which the Pope consented to the postponement of the departure of the army for two years longer. Frederic, on his part, promised to supply money, troops, and ships; and, in case of the non-fulfillment of these conditions within the appointed time, to submit to the threatened sentence of excommunication, and to allow himself and his kingdom to be dealt with as the Holy See should think just and right.[1] Honorius died before the expiration of this term (March 18, 1227).

His successor, *Gregory IX.*, the nephew of Innocent III., though far advanced in years, was full of life and energy, and his piety, his learning, and his eloquence had elicited the praises of the Emperor. Gregory pressed upon Frederic the importance of speedily carrying out his promise. The latter appointed Brindisi as the place of rendezvous, and, after many halts and delays, finally embarked his troops, and set sail August 15, 1227. He had been scarcely three days out, when, feigning indisposition, he changed his course, and returned to the harbor of Otranto. Gregory pronounced sentence of excommunication upon him at *Anagni*, September 29, 1227.

Frederic now gave full vent to his long pent-up anger. In a circular letter, addressed to all the potentates of Europe, he complained in the most bitter terms of the Pope's conduct, and called upon them to unite with him in an effort to crush papal tyranny. He took every occasion to excite the Roman people and nobles against the Pope, and to gain them over to himself; broke treaties which he had entered into with the Holy See; and, finally, roused the Romans to insurrection, thus forcing the Pontiff to withdraw from the city, and retire to Perugia. For these acts of duplicity and violence, Gregory again excommunicated the Emperor, at Easter, 1228.

---

[1] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 36. (Tr.)

But Frederic, though at enmity with the Pope, never thought of relinquishing his vow. Without having obtained absolution from his censures, he got his forces together as rapidly as possible, at Brindisi, and set off on the *fifth*[1] *crusade*, August 11, 1228, publishing, at the same time, a circular letter to Christendom, complaining that his excommunication was undeserved, and that the Pope would listen to no terms.

The Emperor landed at Ptolemaïs in September, but, to his surprise, found that papal envoys were in advance of him, with instructions from the Pope to the masters of the military orders to see that none of their followers served under his banners, and with authority to lay under interdict any place he might enter. He concluded a treaty with the Egyptian sultan *Kamel*, a transaction in which there was a strong suspicion of collusion between the Emperor and the Sultan, but by which the whole of Jerusalem, except the Temple or mosque of Omar, was surrendered to the Christians; the towns of Jaffa, Bethlehem, and Nazareth restored, and a truce of ten years granted. To all appearance, the kingdom of Jerusalem was reëstablished. Frederic entered the city, but the clergy fled at his approach, and religious exercises were suspended in the churches. Attended by a magnificent retinue, he entered the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and, there being no bishop who would perform the ceremony, took the crown from the high altar, and placed it upon his head. Pompous accounts were forwarded to Europe, proclaiming his glorious achievements; while, in reality, the treaty forbade the rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, and the Egyptian sultan was boasting that he had surrendered to the Emperor only ruined churches and tottering walls, and that the truce was of doubtful stability, and might be broken any time, as the Christians of Palestine were protesting against it.

The Emperor, on his return, disembarked at Brindisi, and the Pope, at the instance of the Dominican *Qualo* and the German bishops and princes, consented, after considerable hesitancy,[1] to sign the Peace of *San Germano*, August 28, 1230.[2] Frederic promised to give way in whatever had occasioned his censures; to restore the territory wrested from the Church; to recall and reinstate the exiled bishops; to leave unimpaired, in future, the rights of the Roman and the Sicilian churches, and, finally, to pay a certain indemnity. But he had no intention of making good these obligations; on the contrary, he was loyal to his old principles, and, in a letter addressed to Louis IX. of France, spoke as follows: "It has been my constant aim to reduce the hierarchy to the condition of the apostolic age, when men led apostolic lives. The priests of our own day have grown worldly. The abundance of their wealth chokes every religious sentiment; and hence, as it would be doing them a charitable service to strip them of this baneful wealth, all European princes should direct their efforts to that end." Consistently with these principles, he constantly advocated the policy of depriving the Pope of the States of the Church, and bishops of their fiefs held of the Empire. Restrained by no consideration of justice, and recognizing no law but his own arbitrary will, he endeavored to establish the despotic rule of a few petty princes in Italy, and shocked by his conduct the sentiments and opinions of his contemporaries. In the same spirit, he commissioned Peter de Vineis, his chancellor, to make a "*Collection of the Laws of Sicily*" (A. D. 1231), in which the influence of the Church, then so potent and extensive, is totally ignored; while, on the other hand, a legislative absolutism is claimed for the Emperor, of so wide a reach as to be startling, even for that age.

---

[1] This usually given as the *Sixth*. (Tr.)

In the introduction, Frederic states, with a pompous array of words, that, as head of the *Romano*-German empire, he has a duty to protect and defend the rights of the Church, and to preserve the *public peace*. But it is noteworthy, that he nowhere mentions the *Church* as the source of the royal power. While referring everything to Christ, and professing to hold his power directly from Him, he entirely ignores His Church. According to Tit. 39, any one doing violence to those in the Emperor's service shall receive a double punishment, *ut*

---

[1] *Gerold*, Patriarch of Jerusalem, has left a very unfavorable account of Frederic, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1229, nos. 3 sq., and, ad universos Christi fideles, in *Matt. Paris.*, p. 359 sq. *Hefele*, Vol. V., p. 861–867, and Tübg. Quart., 1863, n. 2.

[2] *Raynaldus* ad an. 1230, nos. 3 sq. Cf. *Raumer*, Vol. III., p. 458 sq.

participatio, the title goes on to explain, *condecens honoris et oneris inducatur.* The source of justice resides in the king; his authority is the sanction of every duty. All authority and power are subordinated to his, and derive their legality from it. Little or nothing is said of the relations of the temporal to the spiritual power, and the responsibility of the former to the latter is put quite out of sight. By Tit. 32, ecclesiastical suits at law are given a *precedence* before civil or other cases; but this is granted *as a concession*, and not as right. Frederic's assumption of imperial omnipotence, so much at variance with his earlier professions,[1] gave grave offense equally to clergy and people—to the former, because he claimed to be at once the source and sanction of all authority in the state, and to the latter, because he governed the state by his absolute will as he might run a machine. He also outraged the feelings of the whole people, by violently destroying institutions that had become endeared to them by national association and historical tradition, and substituting in their stead the arbitrary creations of his own will.[2]

The Emperor's policy will seem still more extraordinary when placed beside the teachings of the great Doctors of the Church—of St. Thomas, for instance, who so faithfully interprets the spirit of the age in which he lived. "When," says this profound Doctor[3] (*De Regimine Principum*, lib. I., c. 14), "when a state is founded, its government should be modeled on that of God Himself. To govern, is to guide the governed to their true destiny. It would seem that to live conformably to virtue, should be the great object of nations. But this object is only secondary to a still higher, which is common to nations and to individuals—viz., to attain by virtue a union with God. To lead men to this sublime destiny belongs to the Church, to the kingdom of Christ, and not to the secular power, and hence arises the necessity of a royal priesthood. This supernatural governance of men belongs not to the kings of this world, but to the priesthood, and preëminently to the Pope, whom all Christian kings must obey as Christ Himself. This was not, indeed, so of the Pagan priesthood, who were subordinate to kings, inasmuch as the sole object of Pagan worship was the temporal well-being of men. But, in the New Law, the priesthood has quite a different mission—a mission to lead men to the possession of a heavenly inheritance, and hence does the law of Christ make kings subject to the priesthood."

---

[1] *Frederic I.*, although a Hohenstaufen, admitted, in a letter written by him to the Greek emperor, Emmanuel, the right of the Roman Church to the two swords (*Goldast.* Const. imperator. IV. 73); and, in his fierce letter to Pope Hadrian, speaks as follows: "Quod in passione sua (Luc. xxii. 38) Christus duobus gladiis contentus fuit, hoc in Romana Ecclesia et in Imperio credimus mirabili providentia declarasse, cum per haec duo rerum capita et principia totus mundus tam in divinis, quam in humanis ordinetur." (*Baron.* ad an. 1159, nro. 52.) *Frederic II.* said: "Gladius materialis constitutus est in subsidium gladii spiritualis." (Constitut. Frid. II. an. 1220, c. 7.) The *Saxon Mirror* (Code), which is by no means partial to the papacy in its tone, recognizes the mutual relations of the temporal and spiritual powers to each other in the following words: "God has left upon earth two swords for the defense of Christendom—the one to the Pope, the other to the Emperor. Should any one resist the spiritual sword of the Pope, the Emperor shall compel his obedience by the temporal; in like manner, it is the duty of the Pope to support the Emperor when necessary," etc. (Book I., art. I., of the Saxon Code, collected by Eiko de Repehowe, sheriff of Salpke, near Magdeburg, 1216; edited by *Sachsse*, Heidelberg, 1848.)

[2] When Louis IX. of France said of Frederic II., that he wished to unite ecclesiastical supremacy and imperial absolutism, he hit exactly the underlying principle of the Emperor's policy. This is stated in the Epistolae *Petri de Vineis*, cura J. R. *Iselin*, Basil, 1740, 2 vols. *Hahn*, Collectio monumentorum veterum, Bruns. 1724–1736, T. I., p. 116–278.

[3] The Constitutiones regum regni Siciliae utriusque, published at Naples, in the year 1786. The analysis of this Code, in *Buss*, Influence of Christianity (Freiburg Journal of Theology, Vol. IV., p. 348–360). The *same*, on St. Thomas Aquinas, p. 379–405. On other complaints against Frederic, cf. *Raumer*, l. c., Vol. III., p. 692 sq.

This remarkable legislation did not, as might have been anticipated, at once stir up a fresh war. The mild and pacific Gregory contented himself, for the present, with publishing five books of *Decretals*, in which he took occasion to refute the false principles of the Sicilian code.[1]

A still further proof of the nobility of Gregory's character was given, when Frederic's son, Henry, to whom he had intrusted the government of Germany,[2] rose in rebellion against his father. Gregory, instead of availing himself of this opportunity to humble the Emperor, wrote (March 13, 1235) to all the princes and bishops of Germany, condemning the rebellion and the unnatural conduct of Henry.

But the magnanimity of Gregory was wholly lost upon Frederic, who still continued to hate him as cordially as ever, and with all the vindictiveness of his nature. It would seem that Frederic had now no greater ambition than to abase and humiliate the Pope; he no longer put bounds to his violence.

The Lombards, having suffered an overwhelming defeat at the battle of Cortenuova (November 27, 1237), expressed themselves ready to submit to Frederic, and to accept very hard and galling terms. Frederic demanded unconditional surrender; but the Lombards, recollecting the fate of other Italian cities, and driven to desperation by the demand, replied,[3] "that they had rather die, sword in hand, than behold their city a heap of ruins, themselves perishing of hunger and want, or dying in slavery, and by the hand of the executioner."

---

[1] Cf. § 227.

[2] Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. III., p. 692 sq.

[3] Cf. *Raumer*, l. c., p. 753 sq.

After the reduction of Milan, the insolence and demands of Frederic grew so excessive, that the Pope found himself necessitated to take what measures he could in self-defense. It was now a matter of life and death. He made an alliance with the Venetians and Genoese, after which he excommunicated[1] Frederic, just as that prince was establishing his natural son *Enzio* upon the throne of Sardinia (A. D. 1238), and released his subjects from their oaths of allegiance (March 20 and 24, 1239). Frederic declared the sentence null and void, and the Pope the enemy of princes, and said that, if all princes thought as he did, he would soon be rid of the pest of the papacy. An angry *correspondence*[2] was now opened between them, in the course of which both resorted to recriminations and to epithets the reverse of complimentary. While the Emperor accused the Pope of shielding heretics, because he protected Milan, which was known to contain many Cathari, the latter retorted by charging Frederic with perjury and blasphemy—a charge for which, it must be admitted, there was abundant foundation in fact—and with having given expression to the blasphemous utterances, that the world had been led astray by the three seducers, *Moses*, *Christ*, and *Mohammed*,[1] and that the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost, and His birth from a creature, were simply impossible.

---

[1] The bull of excommunication, together with the motives, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1239, nro. 2 sq.

[2] First, the letters of the Emperor to the Romans, to the cardinals, and to all princes, in *Petri de Vineis* Epp., lib. I., epp. 6, 7, 21. **H.-Bréholles*, Vie et Correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne, ministre de l'empereur Frédéric II., Paris, 1865. Against these, *Gregorii* Epp. ad omnes principes et Praelatos terrae, in *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 79 sq., in which it is said, among other things: "Ascendit de mari bestia, blasphemiae plena nominibus, quae pedibus ursi et leonis ore desaeviens ac membris formata caeteris sicut pardus, os suum in blasphemias divini nominis aperit, tabernaculum ejus et sanctos, qui in coelis habitant, similibus impetere jaculis non omittit." Among many other grievances, the following charges are brought against him: "Iste Rex pestilentiae a tribus baratoribus, ut ejus verbis utamur, scilicet, *Christo Jesu*, *Moyse et Mahometo*, *totum mundum fuisse deceptum*, et duobus eorum in gloria mortuis, ipsum Jesum in lignum suspensum manifeste proponens, insuper dilucida voce affirmare, vel potius mentiri praesumpsit, quod omnes fatui sunt, qui credunt, nasci de virgine Deum, qui creavit naturam et omnia, potuisse." Frederic's answer, in *Petr. de Vin.* Epp., I. 31, in which the pope, with reference to Apoc. vi. 4, is styled "ipse draco magnus, qui seduxit universum orbem. Antichristus, cujus nos dixit esse praeambulum, et alter Balaam, conductus pretio, ut malediceret nobis, princeps per principes tenebrarum, qui abusi sunt prophetiis."

In the year 1240, Frederic marched on Rome; defeated the Romans; drove the Venetians out of Apulia; expelled all ecclesiastics and monks not subjects of the Empire, and made himself master of Benevento.

Gregory convoked a council, to meet at Rome, and a great number of prelates, in answer to his call, embarked at Genoa; but, while on their voyage, their vessels were attacked by Enzio, and they themselves, to the number of one hundred, either murdered or taken prisoners (May 3, 1241). The news of this terrible outrage gave so violent a shock to Gregory, that he died shortly after from its effects, at the age of one hundred years (August 21, 1241). Frederic, on hearing of the event, made use of the following impious remark:

---

[1] The defense of Frederic, by *Gieseler* (Ch. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 129), is, in our opinion, hardly satisfactory. As early as the year 1201, *Simon of Tournai*, a professor of theology, at Paris, is reported to have said: "Tres sunt qui mundum sectis suis et dogmatibus subjugarunt, Moyses, Jesus et Mahometus. Moyses primo Judaicum populum infatuavit, Jesus Christus a suo nomine Christianos, gentilem populum Mahometus." Cf. *Thomas Cantipratanus* (a Dominican †1263), Bonum universale de apibus, l. II., c. 48, n. 5: "And a man," says Gieseler, "of Frederic's penetration, must, after all this, adopt so frivolous a theory!" But the testimony of a contemporary Mussulman, the iman of the grand mosque of Jerusalem, seems to be conclusive against Frederic (*Reinard*, Extraits des historiens Arabes relatifs aux guerres des Croisades, Paris, 1829, p. 431). Also, *Schlosser-Kriegk* (Univ. Hist., Vol. VII., p. 200), in speaking of Frederic, says: "He was better known among Mohammedans living in the most distant countries, than among his coreligionists in Europe, and not without reason. His best soldiers in the Two Sicilies were Mohammedans; the principles of his philosophy were more in accord with Islam than Christianity, and his passion for women was as fatal to him as of old to Solomon." On the later *work* (which is manifestly a production of the sixteenth century), *De tribus impostoribus*, cf. De impostura religionis breve compendium, seu Liber de trib. impostorib., published, with introd., by *Genthe*, Lps. 1833; again, with a bibliographical preface, by *Weller*, and transl. by *Aester*, Lps. 1846, and in the *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. V., p. 606–609. *Hefele*, Supplem. to Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 339 sq.

"Him who dared harm Augustus, August has taken off; God, who well knows the dark designs of the wicked, has turned them against their authors."

Fearing to further excite public opinion against himself, Frederic permitted the imprisoned prelates to assemble at Naples, and proceed to an election. Their choice fell upon Goffredo Castiglione, a Milanese, and Bishop of Sabina, who took the name of *Celestine IV.* (A. D. 1241), but died after a pontificate of eighteen days. After his death, the Holy See remained vacant for some time. The cardinals, fearing the violence of Frederic, fled, and took refuge in the fortresses about Rome. They finally assembled at Anagni, and elected (June 25, 1243) Cardinal Sinibaldo Fieschi, of Genoa, who took the name of *Innocent IV.*

When Frederic was informed of his election, he said: "As cardinal, Fieschi was my friend; but as pope, he will be my enemy. No Pope can be a Ghibelline."

The new Pontiff assured the Emperor of his desire of having peace, and of his readiness to reconcile him to the Church upon the easiest possible conditions, one of which was that prisoners, secular and ecclesiastical, taken by Enzio in his naval attack off Elba, should be set at liberty; but, he added, if the Emperor feels these conditions burdensome, or himself aggrieved, let the whole matter be referred to a general council, composed of spiritual and temporal princes.

When Frederic was called upon to support his complaints against the Holy See by facts, having nothing of importance to bring forward, he had recourse to all manner of shifts and trifling pretexts to make out a case. But, notwithstanding this, the conditions of peace were drawn up, and about being signed, when Frederic suddenly broke off the negotiations, by demanding to be immediately freed from the ban of the Church. His demand was refused, and, putting every other condition aside, he marched straight on Rome, laying waste the whole country along the line of his march. As the Pope steadily and firmly refused to remove the excommunication until *after* ample satisfaction should have been made to the Holy See, Frederic attempted to get possession of his person; but the attempt was baffled by the hasty flight of the Pope and the College of Cardinals, first to Genoa, and thence to *Lyons*. From the latter place, the Pope issued letters of convocation for the First of Lyons, or

THE THIRTEENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 1245).

There were present at this council one hundred and forty (250?) archbishops and bishops, and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia. Innocent opened the proceedings with an address, in which, taking as his text the words of the Psalmist, "*According to the multitude of my sorrows in my heart, thy comforts have given joy to my soul*,"[1] he gave a most distressing picture of the evils afflicting the Church.

The chief questions that came up for discussion were the relations of the Greek Church to the Latin; the relations of the Church to the Saracens; the condition of the Holy Land; the invasion of Hungary by the Tartars; the quarrel with the Emperor, and the morals of the clergy. Frederic having been declared guilty of infidelity, heresy, perjury, sacrilege, and collusion with the Saracens, was excommunicated and deposed. His chancellor, *Thaddeus of Suessa*, who is referred to in the acts of the council as *knight* and *doctor of laws*, defended his master with ability and eloquence; but some of his arguments are ingenious, and were probably meant to be satirical, but are far from being either apposite or convincing. He argued that the Emperor was not a heretic, because he tolerated no usurers in his dominions; and, in answer to those who reproached Frederic with having enlisted Saracens in his army, whom he ordered or permitted to shed the blood of Christians, plunder and destroy churches, he said the Emperor had done so from a tender solicitude for Christians whose places the Saracens filled, and whose lives were thus spared. In reply to the charge of immorality, he said the Emperor retained Saracen women at his court to do fancy work, and to entertain him with their musical performances; and to those who complained of the imprisonment and harsh treatment of the prelates made prisoners by Enzio, he had the cool assurance to say that the affair grieved the Emperor exceedingly, and was entirely accidental, having happened through a misunderstanding.

The protest sent by Frederic to all princes, in which he endeavored to show them the Pope could not punish princes, met with about as much favor as the declamatory efforts of the partisans of imperial absolutism had formerly received. The mendicant orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assissi became now the powerful auxiliaries of the Holy See, and fortunately counteracted the pernicious influence of the Troubadours, or *Minnesänger*, from whose caustic raillery truths the most sacred were not secure. Henry had so far lost his former credit with the princes of Germany, who recognized the justice and necessity of the sentence pronounced against him at Lyons, that they proceeded, at the diet of Hochheim (May, 1246), near Würzburg, to the election of one to take his place. Their votes were given in favor of *Henry Raspe*, Landgrave of Thuringia; but he having died a few months later (February, 1247), *William*, the young Count *of Holland*, was elected to succeed to him, chiefly through the efforts of Capucius, the papal legate, and the Rhenish archbishops.

---

[1] Ps. xciii.

Conrad IV., Frederic's son, carried on the contest against both these kings; while his father, in person, levied war in Apulia, and forced the clergy to make no account of the Pope's excommunication. But the good fortune which had thus far sustained the Emperor, was now rapidly deserting him. After the promulgation of the sentence of Lyons, disaster after disaster overtook him. The imperial cities of Central Italy threw off their allegiance, and espoused the Pope's cause; the Guelfs, mustering all their strength, rose in their might against him; he himself suffered a terrible defeat before Parma, and his son Enzio was beaten and taken prisoner by the Bolognese. While on his way, at the head of a powerful army, to the deliverance of Enzio, Frederic died (December 13, 1250). He made his confession to the Archbishop of Palermo, by whom he was absolved from the ban of the Church, and, at his own request, was buried in the cathedral of that city. Shortly before his death, he had perpetrated some of the most frightful atrocities of his life. He had the bishop of Arezzo disgracefully executed; punished a conspiracy in Sicily, by taking vengeance upon the defenseless women and children, and had the eyes of his confidential counselor, *Pietro delle Vigne*, the author of the outrageous manifesto against the Holy See, who was called his "right arm," put out, simply because, as it is said, he was suspected of having made an attempt to poison the Emperor.[1]

The Holy See came victorious from this terrible conflict, but bore from it severe wounds, which were centuries in healing. The Popes had been reduced to the necessity of laying heavy taxes upon the churches throughout Christendom, and this had the effect of loosing the bonds which had heretofore kept Christian nations united to the Holy See. It was claimed that as the contest did not, as in the case of investitures, concern the freedom of the Church, but seemed to be more directly connected with territorial acquisition, there was no adequate reason why these taxes should be levied.

---

[1] His last will, in *Muratori*, T. IX., p. 661. Cf. *Raumer*, Vol. IV., p. 263 sq.; on Peter de Vineis, p. 256–260, and 632–638.

After the death of Frederick II., Innocent went back to Italy. He declared that the house of Hohenstaufen had forfeited the throne. He entered into an alliance with the Lombards, and regarding Sicily as having reverted to its former lord, and consequently as a fief of the Holy See, and wishing to confer it upon some prince who would be able to retain it, he first made a tender of it to *Richard*, Count of Cornwall, and brother of Henry III., King of England; next to *Charles of Anjou*, brother of Louis IX., King of France; and, finally, to the English prince, *Edmund*. Meanwhile, *Conrad IV.*, Frederic's son, elected king of the Romans, in 1254, did all in his power to make good his claims in Italy. Conrad died soon after (A. D. 1254), leaving a young son, *Conradin*, then only three years of age,[1] whose rights the Pope showed a disposition to protect. *Manfred*, the natural brother, and formerly the tutor of Conrad, entered into negotiations with the Pope for the kingdom of Sicily, which he agreed to accept as a fief of the Holy See (September, 1254). But fresh differences having broken out between them, Manfred took up arms, ostensibly in the interests of Conradin, and seized upon Apulia and Calabria. In the meantime, Innocent died at Naples, December 7, 1254. The efforts of *Alexander IV.*, his successor, to restore peace to the Church, were equally fruitless. He reluctantly excommunicated Manfred, who, disregarding the sentence, had himself crowned king of the Two Sicilies, at Palermo (A. D. 1258), after which he stirred up such commotions in Rome, that the Pope was forced to seek safety by flight to Viterbo. The young prince Edmund being unable, in consequence of the disturbed state of England, to accept the proffered crown of Sicily, Alexander, in 1260, entered into negotiations with Manfred, but died before any satisfactory conclusion could be reached (May, 1261). Before his death, the influence of Alexander seemed to have been on the increase in Germany, where, on the death of William (A. D. 1256), *Richard of Cornwall* and *Alphonso the Wise, king of Castile*, received each an equal number of votes for emperor.

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1254, n. 46. *Raumer*, Vol. IV., p. 351 sq.

Alexander's successor, *Urban IV.*, cited Manfred to appear before him, at Rome, and answer the serious charges made against him, but Manfred wholly disregarded the citation. The Pope then published a crusade against him, and, in spite of the prudent counsel of Louis IX., gave the crown of Sicily to *Charles*, Count *of Anjou*, who, after having subscribed to the necessary conditions, was crowned by Urban's successor, *Clement IV.* Charles met, defeated, and slew Manfred at the battle of *Benevento*, and thus asserted, by arms, his right over Sicily, which, in spite of the wise and well-meant counsel of the Pope, he governed as a tyrant, and was more detested by the people than the Hohenstaufens themselves.

The discontented inhabitants invited Conradin from Germany to place himself at their head. The Pope warned the young prince not to accept; threatened him with censure if he should, and, finally, excommunicated him as soon as he entered Italy (A. D. 1267). His campaign was short, decisive, and disastrous. Defeated at the battle of Tagliacozzo, on the borders of the lake of Celano (October 2, 1268), he and his friend, Frederic of Austria, fell into the hands of the victor, and, in spite of the earnest and energetic appeals of the Pope and Louis IX., whom the Pope had interested in their favor,[1] addressed to Charles in the hope of disposing him to clemency, were beheaded at Naples, October 29, 1268.

---

[1] *Raynaldus* ad a. 1268, nr. 34 sq.: Peperit sibi ea severitate Carolus non modo illius aetatis hominum, sed etiam futurorum saeculorum invidiam et odia collegit: gravissimeque, ut asserunt Ricordanus et Joannes Villanus, a Pontifice increpatus est: tantum abest quod aliqui commenti sunt, qui tanto Pontifici ac re ipsa clementissimo crudelitatis maculam aspergere voluerunt, atque illi hoc famosum dictum impegere: *Vita Conradini mors Caroli, mors Conradini vita Caroli.* Cf. *Raumer*, Vol. IV., p. 613–620.

Among the many virtues of this Pope, his detestation of nepotism is conspicuous. He ordered all his relations to keep at a distance from him, unless when invited to approach.

§ 223. *Crusades of St. Louis* (*IX.*)—*Pragmatic Sanction.*

Ludovici Vita et conversatio per Gaufred. de Belloloco confessar. et *Guil. Carnotens.* capellan. ejus and *Ludov.* Ep. de captatione et liberatione sua (*du Chesne*, T. V.) *Bollandi* Acta sanctorum ad 25. mens. Aug. †* *Villeneuve Trans*, Hist. de St. Louis, roi de France, Paris, 1839, 3 vols. †*Scholten*, Hist. of St. Louis, Münster, 1850, sq., 2 vols. †*Cantù*, Vol. III., p. 318–350. *Damberger*, Vol. X., in many places. *Wilken*, The Crusades, Vol. VII. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. IV., p. 269–312. *Michaud*, Hist. des Croisades, Par. 1854.

The deplorable contests between the Papacy and the Empire did much to cool the enthusiasm of European nations for expeditions to the Holy Land. The Sultan of Egypt, by the aid of the savage hordes of the *Khoswaresmian* tribe, whom he had enlisted in his service, succeeded, after many ineffectual efforts, in taking Jerusalem (A. D. 1247).

Louis IX., the pious king of France, and perfect type of a mediæval prince, who had long desired to lead an army to the Holy Land, was taken suddenly and dangerously ill, and while in this critical condition made a vow, that if he should recover, he would undertake a crusade. His eloquence and his example did much toward inspiring those about him with his own sentiments. During Christmas-tide of the year 1245, a few days after he had made his vow, he presented, according to a custom of his court in those days, each of his knights with a robe, on which was wrought a red cross between the shoulders. They enjoyed the pleasantry, but at once expressed their willingness to follow their king to the East. Nearly two years and a half more were spent in preparations, and on the 12th of June, 1248, Louis received from the papal legate, at the abbey of St. Denys, the pilgrim's wallet and staff, and the oriflamme or sacred banner, and at the end of August set sail from France. Fully persuaded that it was impossible to hold Palestine without having possession of Egypt, Louis directed the *sixth crusade*[1] toward the coast of

---

[1] Usually called the seventh. (Tr.)

Africa, and, having landed, captured Damietta (A. D. 1249). Had order been preserved and ordinary prudence used, the crusade might have secured some substantial results; but the folly of the Count of *Artois*, the king's brother, who, despite the warning of the grand-master of the Templars, attacked the Saracens, near Mansourah, before the bulk of the main army had come up, proved fatal to the expedition. The Christians were defeated, and, during the retreat, the king was himself taken prisoner (A. D. 1250). He bore his captivity with exemplary fortitude, and manifested throughout an unclouded trust in God. The Pope wrote him letters of condolence, encouraging him to persevere, and to bow in humble submission to the unsearchable counsels of God. He also ordered prayers to be said in all the churches of France for the captives. "O treacherous East!" said the Pope. "O dark and fatal Egypt! O Jerusalem, whose deliverance has cost so much blood, when, oh when wilt thou console the Church for all the sorrows thou hast brought upon her!" He, at the same time, appealed to all Christians of the West, begging them to aid, either personally or by contribution, in freeing their captive brethren in the East.

Peace was offered to the king if he would surrender all the Christian fortresses in Syria. He replied, that as these belonged to Frederick II. as king of Jerusalem, he could not dispose of them. It was finally arranged that Damietta should be given up; the king pay one million byzants for his own ransom, and a half a million French livres for that of his barons. After his release, Louis spent four years more in the East, visiting and repairing the fortresses of Acre, Sidon, Jaffa, and Caesarea. He was, at the end of this time, called to France by the death of his mother, Blanche, the queen-regent. The wise and good king at once set to work with commendable zeal to forward the interests of his kingdom, and to raise the condition of *Tiers État.*

In 1268, Pope *Clement IV.* published a decree, declaring that the Roman Pontiff might dispose of all benefices, whether already vacant or yet to fall vacant, as he should see fit. Hence, benefices not yet vacant, but already given out or collated, were called *expectancies* (expectativae, sc. dignitates). French historians say that this decree was the occasion of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, said to have been published by Louis IX., in 1268, containing the following articles: The first declares the full liberty of ordinary collations to benefices; the second, the liberty of canonical elections; the third favors the extirpation of simony; the fourth recurs to first and second, and ordains that dispensations of prelacies and collations to benefices shall be according to the common law, the councils, and the Fathers; the fifth renews and approves the franchise, the prerogatives, and privileges granted by former kings and by himself to churches, monasteries, and other institutions of a religious character, and to ecclesiastics. Such is, substantially, the text as given in the oldest and best authenticated manuscripts; but to these a sixth article is added in more modern copies, which runs as follows: "We forbid any one to levy or collect taxes, and exactions, either already imposed or that may be imposed, by the Court of Rome, except for an urgent cause, and with the consent of the crown and the Church."[1]

There are both *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* arguments[2] to prove that Louis IX. is not the author of these articles, but notably the declaration, entirely out of keeping with the sentiments of a religiously minded prince of the Middle Ages, that "*the kingdom of France, recognizing no other superior or protector than God Almighty*, is independent of all men, and consequently of the Pope." The first five articles were probably intended by their author or authors to lead the way to the sixth, which has been proved by Thomassini, Roncaglia, and other critics to be an addition of more recent date.

---

[1] Cf. *Darras*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 392. Also *Blunt*, Doctrinal and Historical Theology, art. Prag. Sanct. (Tr.)

[2] This Pragm. Sanction in five, and also in six, articles, in *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 1259–1262, and Bibliotheca Patrum (Paris), T. VI., p. 1273. Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1268, nr. 37, and *Spondanus* ad an. 1268, nr. 9. Its authenticity is questioned by *Thomassy*, Paris and Montpellier,1844; second ed., Paris, 1866; by Mgr. *Affre*, Appel comme d'abus, p. 46, and by †*Rösen*, The Pragm. Sanction, etc., Münster, 1854. Cf. *Damberger*, Vol. X., p. 988 sq. The *extrinsic* arguments against the authenticity of the Pragmatic Sanction are: 1. It was not promulgated at all; 2. It was first mentioned in 1438, when a Pragmatic Sanction was published at Bourges; and 3. Had these articles been really promulgated by Louis, they

The palmary object of this forgery seems to have been to secure the freedom of ecclesiastical elections; to put a stop to the sale of benefices; but, still more, to guard the national church of France against the constantly increasing taxations of the Popes (quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter depauperatum existit), and to bring again into prominence the privileges granted to it in the lapse of ages (ecclesiis et monasteriis successive concessa innovamus, laudamus, approbamus).

Louis, although far advanced in years, never left off wearing the cross of the crusaders, and when, in 1268, the news reached Europe that *Bibar*, the sultan of Egypt, had taken Antioch, he at once organized another crusade. The pious and chivalric hero, taking in his hand the symbol of man's redemption, again roused the courage and kindled the enthusiasm of the noble sons of France, who flocked in thousands to his side. Louis left France with an army of sixty thousand men; but the fleet having been driven by adverse winds to the coast of Sardinia, it was resolved to make for Tunis, whose king was well disposed to Christianity, in order to establish there a colony, with the ultimate purpose of converting the Mohammedans. The army had hardly disembarked, and encamped on the site of ancient Carthage, when a virulent plague broke out, which swept away nearly half the troops, and to which the king himself was a victim (August 25, 1270).

With Louis died out the last embers of that generous love and buoyant enthusiasm for the Holy Land, which had once set the martial fire of Christendom aglow. The Latins were no longer able to maintain themselves in the East; and the

---

could not have escaped the notice of Boniface VIII., who canonized him in 1294, and who, if he had known of them, would have certainly brought them against him at his canonization. Among the *intrinsic* arguments against their authenticity are the following: 1. The declaration given above, which is entirely out of harmony with the known sentiments and character of Louis; 2. The many variations in the text of the articles, as given in the various manuscript and printed copies, and even the erasions that are plainly visible in the reputed original manuscript at Paris; and 3. Formulas and words are employed in the articles which are not to be found in public documents of that age. Such are: Ad perpetuam rei memoriam; justitiarii, officiarii, loca tenentes. — The authenticity of the Prag. Sanct. is defended by *Soldan*, in Niedner's Journal of Hist. Theol., 1856, p. 377–450.

Greeks, under *Michael Palaeologus*, retook Constantinople, in 1261. The subsequent efforts of *Gregory X.* to arouse the dormant energy of Europe in behalf of the Holy Land were fruitless, and Ptolemaïs, after a gallant defense, was assaulted and taken by the infidels, May 18, A. D. 1291.

D.—BEGINNING OF FRENCH INFLUENCE—TARDINESS OF PAPAL ELECTIONS.

§ 224. *Gregory X.* (A. D. 1271–1276)—*Council of Lyons—Death of St. Thomas Aquinas and of St. Bonaventure—Rudolf of Hapsburg.*

After the death of Clement IV., the Apostolic See was vacant for two years and nine months, and during the whole of this time the cardinals remained in conclave, at Viterbo. They clung obstinately to their respective candidates, but finally settled upon Teobaldo Visconti, of Piacenza (September 7, 1271), who took the name of Gregory X., and was consecrated at Rome, in March, of the following year. He had but shortly before returned from the Holy Land, whither he had gone as papal legate with Prince Edward, and, witnessing there with his own eyes the hardships and trials endured by the Christians, made a vow, before leaving the country, to devote his energies to the work of their deliverance. During the whole of his pontificate, he accordingly kept steadily in view the organization of a crusade, and, in order to bring it more prominently before the people of Christendom, convoked the Second of Lyons, or the

FOURTEENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (A. D. 1274).

There were present at this council five hundred bishops, representing every country of the Catholic world; the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, the grand-master of the Knights of St. John, and above a thousand mitered abbots. The civil power was represented by Philip, king of France; James II., king of Aragon, and by embassadors from Germany, England, Sicily, and the kingdoms of Northern Europe. *St. Thomas Aquinas* died while on his way to the council, and *St. Bonaventure* during its sitting.

The organization of a crusade, to which, it was enacted, all ecclesiastical prebendaries should contribute,[1] and the *reunion of the Churches of the East and the*

---

[1] *Humbertus de Romanis* (General of the Order of St. Dominic, in the name of the Pope), De his quae tractanda videbantur, in Conc. Generali Lugd., in

West, formed the chief business of the council. But, besides the enactments touching these questions, there were thirty-two canons passed, regulating the discipline of the Church and providing for the reformation of morals.

One of the disciplinary canons touched on the collation and plurality of benefices; another condemned the Flagellants; and a third was directed against the needless multiplication of religious orders.[1]

When the Pope celebrated pontifically on the 1st of July, the Epistle and Gospel were read in both Greek and Latin; and the *Credo*—including the addition, "*Qui a Patre Filioque procedit*," which was thrice repeated—was chanted in both languages. At the close of the Mass, letters were read from the Greek emperor, Michael Palæologus, and the Greek bishops, in which they made a full and explicit confession of the orthodox faith, and in unequivocal terms recognized the Primacy of the Church of Rome. They addressed the Pope under the titles of "First and Sovereign Pontiff, Ecumenical Pope, and Common Father of all Christendom." The imperial embassador, in the name of the Emperor and his own, abjured the schism, and made a profession of the "Catholic, orthodox, and Roman faith."[2]

In the East, where the Greeks had been taught for centuries to look upon the Latins as heretics, as Pagans, and worse than Jews and Mohammedans, the act of union, as might have been foreseen, met with a very determined opposition. Fasts, ablutions, and processions were resorted to by the ignorant and supersti-

---

Mansi, T. XXI., p. 109 sq. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., VI., 108–130. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Eccl. Schism, Vol. I., p. 346–353.

[1] The Acts, in *Mansi*, T. XXIV., p. 38 sq. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 670. The Epp. Gregorii X., in *Mansi*, T. XXIV., p. 27 sq. 107. The taxation of all benefices in the diocese of *Constance*, officially prescribed in the "Liber decimationis cleri Constanc. pro papa de anno 1275," published by Dean *Haid*, in Vol. I. of the Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Freib. 1865. This is undoubtedly the oldest statistics of the diocese of Constance.

[2] The formula of conciliation is couched in the following terms, in can. 11: "Fideli ac devota confessione fatemur, quod Spiritus St. aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ab uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit." — And concerning the Roman Church, the profession of faith runs thus: "Ipsa quoque sancta Romana Ecclesia summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam ecclesiam catholicam obtinet, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro apostolorum principe sive vertice, cujus Romanus pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit. Et sicut prae caeteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones suo debent judicio definiri. Ad quam potest gravatus quilibet super negotiis ad ecclesiasticum forum pertinentibus appellare, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius potest judicium recurri, et eidem omnes ecclesiae sunt subjectae, et ipsarum praelati obedientiam et reverentiam sibi dant. Ad hanc autem sic potestatis plenitudo consistit, quod ecclesias ceteras ad solicitudinis partes admittit, quarum multas et patriarchales praecipue, diversis privilegiis eadem Romana Ecclesia honoravit, sua tamen observata praerogativa, tum in generalibus conciliis, tum in aliquibus aliis, semper salva."

tious populace, to expiate the guilt which, it was supposed, necessarily attached to this act of infidelity on the part of their bishops.[1]

After the death of Richard of Cornwall, in 1273, the electoral princes of Germany, yielding to the expressed wish of the Pope, and acting under the guidance of the Archbishop of Mentz, the Pope's special friend, elected *Rudolph, Count of Hapsburg*, who, when still quite a youth in the suite of the Emperor Frederic II., had gained for himself the love and esteem of all with whom he came in contact. He was specially agreeable to the spiritual princes, who believed that the strength of character and the resolution which he was known to possess were necessary to uphold the tottering throne, to restore the unity of the empire, and to reconcile the conflicting claims of Church and State. He wrote a respectful letter to the Pope, asking him to confirm the election and to confer the imperial dignity. His chancellor, Otho, went to Lyons, and there promised, under oath, in Rudolph's name, that all the rights and prerogatives granted to the Roman Church by Otho IV. and Frederic II. should remain unimpaired; that the States of the Church should not be attacked, and that war should not be waged against the King of Sicily. At a meeting between Gregory and Rudolph, at Lausanne, in October, 1275, the latter took the cross, promised to go to Rome the year following for coronation, renewed the oath taken by his chancellor, and made still larger concessions to the Holy See.[2] He also gave his word, under oath, to guarantee the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and the right of appeal; to labor for the suppression of heresy, and to renounce the *right of spoil* (jus spolii).[3]

On the other hand, the Pope published sentence of excommunication against all who should refuse to recognize Rudolph as Emperor. Having thus established friendly relations with the Emperor, the Pope set out for Rome, but died on the way, at Arezzo, in January, 1276. Shortly before his death, he warned the tyrannical Charles of Anjou that the divine vengeance would soon overtake him.

In order to put a stop in future to any such delay as had taken place in his own election, Gregory drew up a constitution, which, in spite of the vigorous opposition of the cardinals, was read between the fourth and fifth sessions of the council, and received the approbation of the Fathers. This constitution is still in force and acted upon. It ordains that, on the death of a pope, the cardinals shall go into *conclave*, and remain there until they shall have chosen a successor. Should, however, more than three, or at most five days elapse before a choice is made, their fare shall grow daily more scant in proportion to the length of the delay, until it is reduced to bread, water, and wine, which shall be their only nourishment until their work is done.[4]

---

[1] Cf. *Darras*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., pp. 399, 400. (Tr.)

[2] *Gerbert*, Cod. epistolar. Rudolphi I. St. Blasii, 1772 f. *Bodmann*, Cod. Rud I. epp. 230 anecdotas continentes., Lps., 1806. Cf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1274, nr. 5 sq. and **Hefele*, The Interregnum and the Fall of the Hohenstaufens (Suppl. to Ch. Hist., Vol. II.)

[3] By the *jus spolii* sovereigns claimed as theirs such property of deceased priests and bishops as had been accumulated from their benefices. (Tr.)

[4] *Gregorii*, constitutio II. de electione et electi potestate (*Mansi*, T. XXIV.,

§ 225. *The Popes from Innocent V.* (A. D. 1276) *until the Abdication of Celestine V.* (A. D. 1294.)

Gregory was succeeded by Peter of Tarantaise, a Dominican, who, as Archbishop of Lyons, was universally esteemed for his personal worth and ability. As Pope, he took the name of Innocent V. He gave bright promise of great usefulness to the Church, but he had time only to reconcile the Guelfs and Ghibellines of Tuscany, when he died, after a short pontificate of five months. Thirty-nine days later, he was followed to the grave by his successor, Cardinal Ottoboni Fieschi, a nephew of Innocent IV., who, as Pope, bore the name of Hadrian V. His successor, John XXI., a Portuguese by birth, and celebrated for his knowledge and skill in medicine, displayed remarkable energy and tact in governing the Church during his short pontificate of seven months. He was killed at Viterbo by the falling in of the ceiling of his chamber.[1]

Cardinal Cajetan Orsini was elected to succeed him in November, 1277. He took the name of *Nicholas III.* He displayed considerable vigor in dealing with Charles of Anjou, whom he deprived of the government of Sicily and forced to resign the title of Roman Senator.

Rudolph of Hapsburg made a formal resignation of all imperial rights over the cities of the Romagna, and released them from their oaths of fealty; and the Pope, in turn, nego-

---

p. 81-86; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 705-708): Quod (servato libero ad secretam cameram aditu) ita claudatur undique, et nullus illuc intrare valeat vel exire: nulli ad eosdem cardinales aditus pateat vel facultas secrete loquendi cum eis: nec ipsi aliquos ad se venientes admittant, nisi eos, qui de voluntate omnium cardinalium inibi praesentium pro iis tantum, quae ad electionis instantis negotium pertinent, vocarentur. — In conclavi tamen praedicto aliqua fenestra competens dimittatur, per quam eisdem cardinalibus ad victum necessaria commode ministrentur; sed per eam nulli ad ipsos patere possit ingressus. Verum si, quod absit, intra tres dies, postquam, ut praedicitur, conclave praedictum iidem cardinales intraverint, non fuerit ipsi ecclesiae de pastore provisum; per spatium quinque dierum immediate sequentium singulis diebus, tam in prandio, quam in coena, uno solo ferculo sint contenti. Quibus provisione non facta decursis, ex tunc tantummodo panis, vinum et aqua ministrentur eisdem, donec eadem provisio subsequatur. Cf. *Hefele*, VI., 125 sq.

[1] On all the three, cf. *Mansi*, T. XXIV., p. 153-183.

tiated a peace favoring the pretensions of Rudolph[1] and detrimental to those of Charles of Anjou over Tuscany.

The Pope died shortly after (August, 1280), leaving behind him the unenviable reputation of having raised a great many of the members of the already too powerful family of the Orsini, to which he belonged, to positions of honor and influence. His bad example was, unfortunately, too frequently followed by succeeding Popes.

In the conclave which assembled at Viterbo to choose a successor, the politic Charles of Anjou exercised an undue influence, and, by intimidating the cardinals, secured the election of the French cardinal Simon de Brie, a man entirely devoted to his interests, who, as Pope, took the name of Martin IV. (A. D. 1281–1285.)[2] From the accession of this Pope dates the beginning of those trials which came upon the Holy See in succeeding years; and it may be truly said that the policy of France during this period was more disastrous to the interests of the papacy than the fierce hostility of the Hohenstaufens had been. Instead of opposing the tyranny of Charles of Anjou by the weight of his authority, he is reproached with having played into the hands of that prince, and with having favored the Guelfs by making himself the tool of their enmity against the Ghibellines, whose most important city, Forlì, he laid under interdict. In the course of his pontificate, he created nine cardinals, of whom four were French. But he lived to bitterly regret his partiality and see it atoned for by the horrible massacre of the French, known as the "*Sicilian Vespers*"[3] (March 30, 1282), during which twenty-four thousand French inhabitants of the island, without distinction of age, sex, or condition, were murdered. The conspiracy was organized and directed by *John of Procida*, a knight of Salerno, who had sworn to avenge the death of the young and hapless Conradin, with the consent and connivance of *Peter III.*, King of Aragon, who had married Constantia, the daughter of Manfred and cousin of Conradin, and was consequently next heir to Naples and Sicily. The result of the terrible massacre was the union of the kingdoms of Sicily and Aragon.[1] Pope Martin excommunicated Peter III., declaring that he had forfeited the kingdom of Aragon, which, it was claimed, was a fief of the Holy See, and the kingdom of Valencia, which, together with the countship of Barcelona, he offered to confer upon Charles of Valois, the second son of Philip the Bold, king of France. But ecclesiastical censures of a character *so* extravagant were necessarily without effect. Peter made captive the only son of Charles, left Aragon by last will to his eldest son, Alphonso, and Sicily to his second son, James. Both Charles of Anjou and Pope Martin died soon after (A. D. 1285); the latter at Perugia, where he was buried.

---

[1] Vita Nicolai Papae III., in *Mansi*, T. XXIV., p. 191. The acts concerning the possessions of the States of the Church, see in *Raynald.* ad an. 1278, nros. 51, 62.

[2] Though he was in fact but the second of the name, yet the enumeration of both popes Marinus in the list of Martins, occasioned the error, which usage has sanctioned. (Tr.)

[3] *Raynald*, ad an. 1282. *Schlosser*, Univ. Hist., Vol. III., Pt. II., sec. 2., p. 71 sq.; in the new revised ed. *Schlosser-Kriegh*, Vol. VII., p. 330 sq.

The cardinals present in Perugia chose, without formally going into conclave, James Savelli, a man far advanced in age and broken with infirmity, as successor to Martin. He took the name of *Honorius IV.* (A. D. 1285–1287.) While displaying more prudence than his predecessor, he adopted pretty much the same policy. He laid the whole of Sicily under interdict, deposed the three bishops who had crowned James, and, after declaring Peter III. to have forfeited the crown of Sicily, pronounced him excommunicate. He also made, during the interregnum, many useful laws for Sicily, restraining the royal power and limiting the imposition of taxes to certain occasions which he named. But all his efforts to adjust the affairs of this kingdom satisfactorily were utter failures.

After his death, the cardinals, obedient to the constitution of Gregory, assembled in conclave, and elected Jerome of Ascoli, previously the general of the Franciscan order. There had been a vacancy of ten months, occasioned by a plague which desolated Italy from end to end. Jerome could hardly be prevailed upon to accept the papacy, but finally yielding to the solicitations of the cardinals, was consecrated under the name of *Nicholas IV.* (A. D. 1288–1292.) His efforts were equally as ineffectual as those of his predecessors to restore Sicily to the house of Anjou, or to induce James of Aragon to renounce his pretensions to the crown. He did, however, succeed in obtaining the freedom of Charles II. of Naples. He was still further pained when the news reached him of the capture of *Ptolemaïs* (Acre), the last stronghold of the Christians in the East (May 18, 1291). His appeals to the princes of Christendom to organize another crusade were met by plausible excuses and evasive pretexts. The West had indeed reaped many and precious *fruits from the Crusades;*[1] and now, if they were shut out from the hallowed land whose possession they so much desired, they had no one to blame for it but themselves. The spirit of Christian unity and fellowship, and the bond of common aspirations and common interests, among the nations of Western Christendom, so necessary in a contest against the power of Islam, had been utterly destroyed by petty jealousies and intestine feuds. The religious and chivalric enthusiasm which had swelled the hearts and inspired the sentiments of the early crusaders gave place to purely military considerations, to the ambition of emperors and kings, and to the sordid interests of avaricious speculators.

---

[1] Gesta Petri regis (*Muratori*, thesaur. ital. T. X., P. V.), cf. Mart. IV., Epp. in *d Achery*, Spicileg., T. III., p. 684.

Innocent III. had made a vain effort to restore the Crusades to their original purpose, but all future calls for fresh expeditions were suspected, by both ecclesiastics and laymen, as being only clever contrivances, devised by popes and princes, to extort money under false pretenses.

That the Crusades have had momentous and far-reaching consequences can not be denied. All who have been at the pains of examining calmly and philosophically the general condition of Europe at their commencement and close, agree in admitting that they were the source of innumerable advantages to *civilization.* The crusaders, in the course of these expeditions, came into immediate contact with the civilization of the Greek and the Saracen—each far more cultivated and advanced than themselves. Their journeys to and fro by land, and their voyages by sea, taught them the science of navigation and familiarized them with the methods of overland travel; and, as a consequence, an impulse was given to commercial enterprise, both by sea and land; industry found new markets for its products; the grace and beauty of Eastern architecture were successfully imitated in the West; sciences began to flourish, and the wealth and comparative refinement of the Greeks and Saracens left a vivid impression, and were not without a considerable influence on the minds of the less cultured strangers of the West.

---

[1] *Heeren*, Development of the Results of the Crusades for Europe, Göttingen, 1808. — Our exposition is according to *Ratisbonne*, Vie de St. Bernard, p. 41–49. *Cantù*, Vol. VII., p. 464–499.

Nor were these the only or most important consequences of the Crusades. European society, whose very existence was threatened by bold and reckless invaders, ready and anxious to lay waste the fair countries of the West, rid itself of a dangerous and powerful foe, and became in turn conquering and aggressive. The narrow and selfish policy of feudalism widened and developed until it embraced a community of interests affecting every country of Europe, and gave rise to a spirit of political freedom which gradually enfranchised nations and peoples without doing violence to the existing bonds of society.

Moreover, apart from the political advantages, social changes, and material progress resulting from the Crusades, they insured, above all, the triumph of the *religious principle.* This principle, instead of being the outcome of human reason, was rather directly antagonistic to it—took it by surprise, went beyond it, and superseded it. It quickened the faith of the believer, controlled and guided his line of thought, and crushed out *the germs of religious skepticism before they had sprung into life and vigor.*

This healthy *intellectual and moral influence* gave a definite purpose and deep significance to the Crusades. The re-awakening of faith, and its triumph over the vagaries of rationalism, at the very moment when rationalism was about to chill the heart and turn intellectual effort from its true direction, are to the Christian world the immediate, the direct, and the unlooked-for results of the Crusades. These results, and these alone, will adequately account for the zeal and enthusiasm of the Christian preachers, and the deep and absorbing interest of those apostles of faith and angels of peace who labored so energetically and persistently to secure the success of the expeditions to the Holy Land; while Abelard and his disciples, on the other hand, regarded them with cold indifference, pronounced them imprudent and foolish, and employed all the varied resources of a wayward and stubborn human reason in combating them. *The foolishness of the Cross confounded then the wisdom of Christian rationalism, as in a former age it had confounded the wisdom of the Pagan intellect.*

The sight of Jerusalem, the Holy City, and the memories called up by the scenes where our Lord, by his sufferings and death, had atoned for the sins of mankind, roused the religious feelings of the Middle Ages as they could have been roused in no other way.

After the death of Hadrian V., the cardinals somewhat modified the constitution of Gregory X. concerning the holding of conclaves; and, as a consequence of such action, on the death of Pope Nicholas IV., on Good Friday of 1292, there was a long vacancy of twenty-seven months, the effects of which were felt throughout the whole Western Church. Of the twelve cardinals who went into conclave, some were in the interests of the family of the Colonnas, which was much favored by the last Pope, and others in the interests of the family of the Orsini, which was entirely devoted to the cause of the house of Anjou. After many meetings in both Rome and Perugia, without being able to agree upon a candidate satisfactory to both parties, their attention was directed to *Peter*, a saintly *hermit*, living in the wilds of the Abruzzi, near Sulmona, who had gained some notoriety by being the founder of the Celestines. Strangely enough, when his name was proposed to the cardinals then in conclave at Perugia, they all gave their votes in his favor, and the obscure hermit was proclaimed Pope (June 7, 1294), under the name of *Celestine V.* (from June to December, 1294.)

The new Pope was indeed worthy of the reputation that had gone abroad concerning his sanctity; and, were proof of this required, the fact that he was placed on the roll of the saints by Clement V. as early as 1313 would be sufficient. But private virtues, no matter how numerous or exalted, do not imply a capacity to govern the Church or the ability to keep from being overreached by astute secular princes.[1] Celestine had, moreover, the misfortune of falling completely under the influence of Charles II. of Naples, who, availing himself of all the arts of intrigue and practicing upon the good man's simplicity, had three Neapolitan and seven French cardinals nominated in a single day.[2] The consciousness of his unfitness for his position grew daily upon his mind. When advent came, he expressed an intention of intrusting the government of the Church to a commission of three cardinals, in order to retire to a solitude during that season, and give himself up wholly to prayer and meditation; but, being prevented by Cardinal Matteo Orsini from doing so, he began to cast about for new expedients to satisfy his desire for prayer and quiet, and to regain his former peace of conscience. Cardinal Stephanesius tells us that Celestine, having no one superior to himself into whose hands he might resign the dignity, sought counsel among his friends and those in whose learning and prudence he trusted, as to whether he might abdicate. Being informed that he *might*, he at once expressed his intention of *doing so.* When Charles II. and the monks of his own order who were about him heard of his intention, they did all in their power to change him. A great procession of the clergy and people appeared before his palace, beseeching him not to resign his dignity; but Celestine had made up his mind once for all. Fearing that the mere assent of the College of Cardinals to his resignation might not be sufficient for the validity of the act, he published a special *constitution* covering the ground, in which he declared that a pope might abdicate, and that the College of Cardinals was competent to receive the act of formal abdication.[1] He then stated to the cardinals that he had been led by a consciousness of his unworthiness, by a taste for solitude, and by a desire to quiet his troubled conscience, to lay down the dignity which they had conferred upon him, and then retire from the honors and cares of the world. His successor, fearing that he might come forth from his solitude and again assert his claims to the papacy, thus causing a schism, kept him in close but honorable confinement in the castle of Fumone[2] until his death, which took place shortly after (May 19, 1296).

---

[1] *Jacob. Cardin.* Carmen de vita et canon. Coelestini (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. III., Pt. I.) *Petrus de Alliaco*, Vita Coelest. (*Bolland*, m. Maji, T. IV., p. 485.) Coelest. Opp. ascet. ed. *Telcra*, Neap. 1640, 4to (Max. bibl., T. XXV.), cf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1294. *Ptolemaei de Fiadonib.* h. e. lib. XXIV., c. 29 sq. *Gregororius*, Hist. of the City of Rome during the M. A., Vol. V., p. 508–517. James, the witty archbishop of Genoa, said of Celestine V. that he did many things *de plenitudine postestatis*, but many more *de plenitudine simplicitatis*. (Tr.)

[2] This act had considerable to do with the transference shortly afterward of the Papal See to Avignon. (Tr.)

---

[1] C. unic. Tit. VII. (De Renunciatione) in Sexto. The Constitution was inserted into the Corp. Jur. by Boniface VIII. (Tr.)

[2] This feudal castle is still standing. It is situated on the top of a picturesque mountain, near *Alatri*, not far from the Neapolitan frontier, and commands a magnificent view of the surrounding country. It is now the property of *Marchese Lunghi.* Two rooms, whose walls were of rough stone, were put at the service of the saint. One of these was so small and dingy as to resemble a vault for the dead rather than an abode for the living; and here he spent most of his time. The other has since been changed into a chapel. (Tr.)

The most useful act of the pontificate[1] of Celestine was the renewal of the constitution of Gregory X. concerning the holding of conclaves.

§ 226. *Boniface VIII.* (A. D. 1294–1303)—*Philip IV., King of France.*

I. *Jacob. Cardin.* De elect. et coronat. Bonif. VIII. (*Bolland.* m. Maji, T. IV., p. 462.) *Ptolem. Luc.* h. e., lib. XXIV., c. 29. sq. *Raynald.* ad a. 1294–1303. *Mansi.*, T. XXIV., p. 1131 sq., T. XXV., p. 1–123. *Harduin.*, T. VII., p. 1171 sq. (*P. du Puy*), Hist. du diff. entre le pape Boniface et Phil. le Bel., Par. 1665 f. *Rabanis*, see Phillips C. L., Vol. III., p. 239–261.

II. **Rubei*, Bonif. VIII. et famil. Cajetanor., Rom. 1651. *Vigor.* Hist. eorum, quae acta sunt inter Phil. Pulchr. et Bonif. VIII. 1639, 4to. *Baillet*, Hist. des démêlés du Pape Boniface avec Phil. ed. 2, Paris, 1718. †*Tosti*, Storia di Bonifacio VIII. e de' suoi tempi, divisa in libri sei, Monte Cassino, 1846, 2 Tom.; Germ. Transl., Tübg. 1848. †*Christophe*, Histoire de la papauté au XIV. siècle. Paris, 1853, 2 vols.; Germ. transl. by *Ritter*, Paderborn, 1853, 2 vols. *Planck*, Hist. of the Constitution of Christian Ecclesiastical Society, Vol. V., p. 12–154, who praises this often misrepresented pope, and defends him especially against the Ghibelline poet, Dante (Inferno, Canto XXVII., v. 85; Canto XIX., v. 52). The more severely is he censured by *Drumann*, Hist. of Bonif. VIII., Königsbg. 1852, 2 pts. Cf. **Palma*, Praelect. h. e., T. III., p. 143–189. †*Gengler*, in the Tübg. Quart. 1832, p. 214 sq. †* *Wiseman*, Pope Boniface VIII. (Essays on Various Subjects, Vol. III.) †*Damberger*, Synchronistic Hist., Vol. XII. *Phillips*, C. L., III. 239. *Boutaric*, La France sou Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1861. *Chantrel*, Bonif. VIII., Paris, 1862; *Cesare Cantù*, Boniface VIII., Dante et Ceco d'Ascoli (Revue d'économie chrétienne, Mai, 1866.) **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 251–356. *Gregovorius*, Vol. V., p. 517–585. *Von Reumont*, Vol. II., p. 621–670. — **Hergenröther*, The Catholic Church and the Christian State, Freiburg, 1872, p. 260 sq., Mgr. (Card.) *Matthieu*, Le pouvoir temporel des Papes, p. 318 sq. (Tr.)

When Cardinal Cajetan, *Boniface VIII.*, was elected to take the place of Celestine, the political affairs of Europe were extremely complicated. No satisfactory settlement had yet been reached in Sicily; in Germany, Adolph of Nassau, the successor to Rudolph of Hapsburg, was contending for the crown; England and France were at war; the king of Scotland was the ally of Philip the Fair of France, and Adolph of Nassau and the Count of Flanders the allies of Edward I.

---

[1] It was during this pontificate also that the Holy House of Nazareth was transported by angels from Dalmatia to Loreto. Cf. Rom. Off., December 10th. (Tr.)

of England. In Italy, everything was feverish and unsettled. Partisan spirit ran high; the love of freedom, the desire of domination, and the thirst of conquest filled every breast and occupied the minds of all. Commercial centers contended for naval supremacy. Venice and Genoa, Pisa and Florence, were respectively engaged in a terrific war against each other. Matthew Visconti had made himself master of Milan, and had had himself nominated Imperial Vicar of Lombardy, by the Emperor Adolph, in order the better to subject the whole country to his rule. Under such circumstances, a man like Boniface, on whom nature had lavished her choicest gifts; who was equally skilled in canon and civil law; whose talents and accomplishments fitted him to be no less a secular prince than the Head of the Church; whose strong sense and strength of character enabled him to fully comprehend his mission and his office, and to go straight through with whatever business he had in hand, without turning to the right or the left; who surpassed all his predecessors in talent for affairs, experience of practical life, and in his knowledge of the art of governing, and who was still in the full tide and vigor of manhood, must, when looking back upon the lives and calling up the memories of Gregory VII. and Innocent III., have resolved to follow their example in pursuing a well-defined policy and assuming a bold and determined attitude.

There was an unusual display of *magnificence at his coronation. The two kings, Charles of Naples, and his son, the king of Hungary, walked on either side of Boniface, holding his stirrups.*[1] There were those who interpreted this pomp and display as indicative of Boniface's determination to restore the papacy to its former splendor and power. The character of the first decrees issued by him placed him, as a churchman, beside Innocent III. Although the views entertained by Boniface, touching the relations of Church and State, were not precisely those put forward by his great predecessors, Gregory and Innocent, they differed from them only because the altered circumstances of his age called for a corresponding change of ecclesiastical policy.

---

[1] The humble Celestine V. enjoyed the same honor on a similar occasion. These two princes came there, as in the case of Boniface, not only as feudatories of the Holy See, but because they wished to render a willing homage to the successor of St. Peter. Card. Wiseman, l. c., from Stephanesius, De elect. Bonif., p. 634 — and Raynaldus. (Tr.)

While Charles was still undecided as to what course to pursue, Boniface quitted Naples, and, in spite of the extreme rigor of the season, set out for Rome, where his immediate predecessors had not ventured to reside, and at once set about reducing the strongholds of such of the nobles as resisted his authority. Shortly after, he made an effort to bestow Sicily on Charles II., as a fief of the Holy See; and, in order to insure the success of the project, ceded to James of Sicily, who, on the death of his brother, had been raised to the throne of Aragon, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, as a compensation for his loss. But the Sicilians, whom neither promises nor threats could induce to accept a French ruler, chose Frederic II., the brother of James, for their king. In vain did Boniface employ every means of temporal and spiritual penalty at his command to oblige them to submit. A people who had set ecclesiastical censures at defiance for twenty-three years were not likely to pay much attention to them, now that their interests and their liberties were at stake.

Although the policy of Boniface had been to establish peace among the States of Europe, to defend oppressed princes and prelates, and adjust differences among contending parties and factions, it was not always his fortune to have his labors crowned with success, and he was not unfrequently obliged to employ weapons, both temporal and spiritual, against those who resisted his authority.

His first great difficulty arose from an effort to settle a family quarrel of the Colonnas (*Colonnesi*), by whom he was called in as arbiter.

James and Peter Colonna, uncle and nephew, belonged to the College of Cardidals. James had three brothers, viz., Matthew, Otho, and Landulf, who were co-heirs with him in the vast possessions of the family; but they allowed the cardinal to have the estate in his own name, and to administer it for the common good of all.[1] The cardinal, secure in his possession of the property, refused his three brothers a sufficient allowance to keep them above a condition of indigence.[1] They in consequence appealed to the Pope, who, naturally enough, took measures to have justice done them. The words of Boniface were lost upon the cardinal, who obstinately refused to do fairly by his brothers. So far was the Pope from being at enmity with the *whole* Colonna family that he intrusted the command of the forces sent against Palestrina[2] to Landulf, one of the three brothers mentioned above. Moreover, the Colonnas gave aid and encouragement to the emissaries sent by Frederic of Aragon, then at war with the Pope, into the States of the Church to excite the people to rebellion. But, for all this, the Pope did not take extreme measures against them until every effort at reconciliation had failed.[3] He then demanded that they should surrender the custody of their castles at Palestrina, Zagarolo, and Colonna as pledges of their fidelity and good behavior. This method was constantly resorted to, in those times, by liege lords when they thought they had just reason to suspect the fidelity of their vassals. The demand was refused, but the Pope did not at once take steps to compel the surrender.[4]

---

[1] *Petrini*, Memorie Prenestine, Rome, 1795, 4to. (Tr.)

The two cardinals, who, with many other members of the Colonna family, fled from Rome (May 4, 1297), notwithstanding that they had been among the first to give their votes in favor of Cardinal Cajetan, issued a manifesto, six days later, in which, after declaring that as Celestine's resignation was necessarily invalid, Boniface's title to the papacy could not be sustained, they appealed to a general council for a decision in the matter. They were at great pains to have this widely circulated,[5] and, having affixed one copy to the doors, placed another on the high altar of St. Peter's church.[6] Boniface took prompt and decisive action. That very night he excommunicated and declared war against his rebellious vassals and such of the clergy as had taken sides with them. The friends of Boniface, to whom he had sent invitations to come to his aid, flocked about him, and the neighboring States either sent him troops or assaulted and took the castles of the Colonnas. Palestrina (ancient Praeneste) was the only stronghold they still retained, and against this Boniface now sent all his available forces. Among the captains serving in this expedition were Landulf and Matthew Colonna. The siege was pushed with great vigor, and the defense was for some time equally vigorous; but the Colonnas eventually surrendered, and all the members of the family, both laymen and ecclesiastics, passed from Palestrina to Rieti, threw themselves at the Pope's feet, sued for pardon, and were absolved from sentence of excommunication. Palestrina was then razed with the ground, according to compact (1299).[1]

---

[1] Bonif. Bull. apud *Raynald.*, p. 1297. (Tr.)

[2] Apud *Petrini*, p. 419.

[3] "Eos studuit (Apost. sedis benigna sinceritas) nunc paternae lenitatis dulcedine alloqui, nunc verbis charitativae correctionis inducere." Bonif. Bull. apud *Raynald.*, p. 225.

[4] Many contemporaries state that Sciarra Colonna seized and plundered the papal treasury, but to this the Pope never alludes. It would seem that his silence would be a sufficient denial of the fact; still it is sustained by a host of respectable authorities, among which the following may be given: *Amalricus*, R. I. S., Tom. III., Pt. II., p. 435; Cronica di Bologna, ib., Tom. XVIII., p. 301; Chronicon Estense, ib., Tom. XV., p. 344; Gregorii Stellae Annales Genuenses, lib. II. ib., Tom. XVIII., p. 1020, quoted by Wiseman. (Tr.)

[5] *Bern. Guido*, R. I. S., Tom. III., p. 670; *Amalricus Angerius*, ib., p. 435.

[6] Histoire des Républiques Italiennes du Moyen Age (p. 34), by J. C. L. *de Sismondi*, Engl. Tr., London, 1832.

After this event, the heads of the Colonna family withdrew from the States of the Church—some retiring to France, and others to Sicily.

But it was from France, which had had so many and so considerable favors from the Holy See, that the most cruel outrages and the most disgraceful treatment were received by Boniface. In order to put an end to the sanguinary war raging between *Edward I.* and *Philip the Fair*, Boniface had remonstrated with the former, and persuaded *Adolph, King of Germany*, to break off his alliance with England (A. D. 1295). In 1297, he threatened the three kings with excommunication if they would not consent to an armistice. This conduct may now seem extravagant; but, in so acting, Boniface did not overstep the authority which, at that time, nearly every State in Christendom recognized as inherent in the *papacy*. To put an end to war, if possible under the circumstances, was not only his right, but his *duty* as well; and he had a still stronger right to insist on an armistice, and to propose that the quarrel should be submitted to his arbitration. Were proof needed to show that on this occasion he had no wish to go beyond the limits of his legitimate authority, it might be found in his moderation and his unwillingness to push affairs to extremes when he learned the irreconcilable nature of the respective claims put forward by the two kings. His legates hesitated to make known his wishes to Philip the Fair, and when they finally mustered courage to do so, that prince stated that in temporal matters he recognized no other superior than God. The Pope did not insist further on this score, but reminded Philip, who, besides being a young man, had all the insolence common to that age, that in whatever concerned the Church, whose privileges he had most unwarrantably invaded by heavily taxing the clergy to defray the expenses of the war, he must heed the voice of the Holy See. Matters went from bad to worse; the French bishops complained of the arbitrary exactions demanded of them; and the Pope, to remedy this condition of things, published his bull "*Clericis laicos*,"[1] in which he emphatically condemned the practice of levying extraordinary taxes upon churches for secular purposes. According to this bull, any layman who should exact from an ecclesiastic, or any ecclesiastic who should pay to a layman an extraordinary impost, was excommunicated. When it is considered that Edward of England pushed his demands so far as to require one-half of the entire income of all ecclesiastics within his realm, and that Philip of France exacted one-fifth of their movable and immovable property, it will be seen that there was ample ground for the publication of the bull. But the French king took his revenge by forbidding,[2] in general terms, the exportation from his kingdom of all gold, silver, and precious stones, and, by implication, the sums of money heretofore sent from France to Rome.[3] This had its effect, for Boniface, who could not well afford to lose the revenues of France, published, in 1296, the bull "*Ineffabilis*," and in 1297, the bulls "*Romana Ecclesia*" and "*Etsi de statu*," besides the brief "*Excidat*," by all of which he put the mildest possible interpretation[4] upon the "*Clericis laicos*," stating that it was not intended by the bull to forbid ecclesiastics to give what they liked, provided only it were *freely given*, and that its censures were meant to strike royal officials who extorted money illegally.

---

[1] Chronica, R. I. S., Tom. II., p. 53.

Boniface also commended the French clergy for their zeal in applying their own incomes and the revenues of the Church to the support of the king, approved of their resolution to pay him a tenth for two years, and brought to a close the *canonization of Louis IX.*, Philip's grandfather, which had been under consideration for twenty-five years.

---

[1] Also given in the Liber sextus decretalium, Lib. III., Tit. XXIII., cap. 3. This bull is little more than an emphatic repetition of the decree of Innocent III. (Can. 46.) The necessity of having the Pope's consent to lay an extraordinary tax on the Church is specially insisted upon.

[2] *Raynald.* an ad. 1296, nro. 25, and *du Puy*, Preuves, p. 13

[3] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 84. (Tr.)

[4] Ibid. nr. 49 conf. *Baillet*, p. 322: Quia ejus est interpretari, cujus est concedere, ad cautelam tuam humana declaratione decernimus, quod si praelatus aliquis *voluntarie* donum aut mutuum tibi dare voluerit, etc.

In 1298, Boniface persuaded the kings of England and France to name him, not in his official capacity as Pope, but as simple *Benedict Cajetan*, mediator between them and arbiter of their quarrel. Benedict very fairly and justly decided that things should remain as they had been previously to the breaking out of the war. To this judgment Philip took exception, and swore he would renew the war on the expiration of the armistice. He was as good as his word, and the assault made upon the Count of Flanders showed that he was terribly in earnest.

Philip was ingenious in devising methods of insult. *Albert of Austria* had deprived Adolph of Nassau of both his crown and his life, and had been in consequence summoned to Rome to answer the charge of high treason. Of this Philip was perfectly well aware, but he, notwithstanding, concluded an alliance with him, and then gravely sent his ambassador, *Nogaret*, to inform the Pope of the fact.

Conduct of this character, and the rapacity of the king and his ministers in seizing the property and revenues of the Church, called forth a most determined resistance from Boniface.

It was just at this time (A. D. 1300) that the centenary jubilee, the only successful and cheering event in the whole pontificate of Boniface, took place in Rome. It was celebrated with great pomp and magnificence, and the piety and devotion of the countless hosts of pilgrims who visited the city on the occasion were touching and gratifying.

In 1301, while affairs were still in the condition described, Boniface had occasion to send an envoy to the French court, and he unfortunately chose for this office *Bernard of Saisset*, bishop of the newly erected see of Pamiers, who, having but lately quarreled with the French king about ecclesiastical rights, was intensely objectionable to him. Bernard, who, it is said, had instructions to obtain the release of the Count of Flanders, approached Philip with an air of authority, spoke imperatively, and threatened him with interdict if the prayer were denied. Philip had the offending prelate driven from court, and delivered into the custody of the Archbishop of Narbonne.

The king, now fairly roused, made up his mind to push matters to their utmost limits. In order the better to avail himself of all the means of sustaining his cause and raising money placed within his power by the laws of the Church, he sought information of those skilled in canon law—a science then highly cultivated in France. The two chief personages who had this matter in hand were *Peter Flotte*, who had great cleverness in devising and making the best of financial resources, and *William Nogaret*, a professor of laws at Montpellier, whom the king called to court in order to avail himself of his knowledge and ability in cloaking royal usurpations under legal forms and the appearances of justice.

These two jurists undertook the prosecution of Bernard of Saisset on charge of high treason, in the course of which they gave ample proof of their knowledge of Byzantino-Roman law. They specially insisted on some remarks made by Bernard on a prophecy which foretold the fall of the French monarchy and dynasty. Nogaret, whose argument was little more than a tissue of silly and contradictory counts, demanded that the Bishop of Pamiers should be judicially and solemnly punished. The latter was then arrested and cast into prison by order of Philip, who next requested the Pope to degrade him, that he might be handed over to the secular authority and punished according to the law of the State. To this demand the Pope replied by suspending the tithes granted to Philip from the revenues of the Church, alleging that they had been diverted from their proper uses. On the same day (December 5, 1301), he published the bull "*Ausculta fili*," in which, after reminding Philip that, though king, still, as a son of the Church, the Pope was his superior on earth, he went on to complain of the violations of ecclesiastical rights by arbitrary appointments to benefices, by oppressive levies of taxes upon the clergy, by measures impeding the administration of ecclesiastical law and interfering with episcopal jurisdiction over monasteries, by seizing upon and appropriating the revenues of vacant bishoprics; and, finally, by circulating counterfeit coin. He also informed the king that he was about to call the French bishops and doctors to a council in Rome, in order to provide measures for the removal of these abuses, and that he would expect him to be present, either personally or by representative.[1] It is said that the Pope, on one occasion, while delivering an allocution at a consistory, so far lost control of his temper and forgot his high dignity as to make an unbecoming allusion to a bodily defect of Peter Flotte, who, he said, was physically blind of an eye, and stone-blind spiritually.

When the papal bull reached Philip,[2] he had it falsified; after which, amid a great display of injured innocence and outraged dignity, he had it publicly burnt (February, 1302). In order to strengthen his cause in every available way, and to forestall the dangerous effects of a threatened interdict, Philip convoked at Paris (April 10, 1302) the *three estates* of his kingdom, and, for the first time, united the clergy, the nobles, and the commoners in opposition to the papacy, just as, five centuries later, they were united in opposition to royalty.

At this assembly, Chancellor Flotte played quite a conspicuous part. An unscrupulous intriguer and dishonest schemer, he brought all his talent, discrimination, and address to bear on an effort to alienate the French clergy from the Pope. "The court of Rome," said he, in a speech to the convened estates, "has arbitrarily conferred bishoprics and some of the best prebends upon unknown strangers, some of whom do not even live among us; thus making it impossible for local prelates to promote men of ability and merit. It has imposed unusual taxes upon churches, shorn archbishops of their legitimate powers by withdrawing suffragan bishops from their jurisdiction, and is now engaged in an effort to make the king himself subject to it. But this can never be, for our royal master recognizes on earth no superior other than God. In view of these aggressions," continued Flotte,

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1301, nros. 13 sq. *du Puy*, Preuves, p. 661; complete in Christophe, T. I., p. 390.

[2] On the falsification of the shorter bull or epistle (*Baillet.*, p. 103), cf. *Spondanus*, Ann. eccl. ad an. 1301, nro. 11. — *De Marca*, De concord. sacerd., Lib. IV., c. 16, presumes, from the insinuations made by Cardinal Aquasparta, that Chancellor *Flotte* was the falsifier. See *Planck*, l. c., p. 96 sq.

"the king has called upon the estates to aid him in maintaining the ancient liberties of the nation."

The nobility and the commoners replied that they were ready to give their wealth and their lives in defense of their liberties, and that if the king should be weak enough to yield to the demands of the Pope, they would resist them. The clergy, intimidated by a menace to the effect that whosoever should oppose these sentiments would be regarded as an enemy to his king and country, assured the monarch of their fidelity and of their willingness to aid him, and begged that they might be permitted to attend the Roman synod in obedience to the Pope's call. Their request being refused, they wrote a letter to the Pope, beseeching him not to sever the ancient alliance between France and the Holy See, nor to insist on their coming to Rome to attend the synod. They also advised him to use great prudence in the matter of ecclesiastical censures, as the laity, in their present temper of mind, would treat them with contemptuous indifference.[1]

Philip wrote a short note to Boniface, in which, after addressing him as *maxima tua fatuitas*, or Your Supreme Stupidity, he went on to say that in temporal matters he recognized no superior, and that he should take it to be the height of folly in any one to pretend to dispute with him the right of disposing of ecclesiastical prebends and their revenues.

Boniface, in an answer written out in presence of the cardinals, denied that he had ever made the claim falsely attributed to him in the interpolated bull, by which he was made to say that "Philip held France as a fief from the Holy See," which, he affirmed, was a corruption and a fabrication. Then he went on to explain that Philip was subject to the Pope, not as a temporal prince (ratione dominii), but in a spiritual sense and as a Christian; and that in temporal matters he was subject to him only when and in so far as there was question of sin and injustice (ratione peccati); and finally, that the Holy See, far from denying, recognized the fact that there was a difference between the two powers established by God.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 88 sq. (Tr.)

In spite of the violent threats of Philip, four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, and six abbots[2] went from France (November, 1302) to Rome, to be present at the council. The enactments of this assembly are summed up in the bull "*Unam sanctam*" (November 18, 1302), which is an exposition of the relations between Church and State—between the spiritual and temporal powers—the line of argument pursued being based on the words of Jeremias i., 10: "Behold, I have set thee over kingdoms and empires."

"There being but one faith and one baptism," says Boniface, "and the Church constituting but one body, there can necessarily be but one Head. The invisible Head is Jesus Christ; the visible, His representatives, the successors to

---

[1] Boniface, in referring to the way in which the two powers are related to each other, adopts the comparison of the sun and moon, used by Gregory VII. and Innocent III. He says: "Scriptum est: fecit Deus duo luminaria magna, luminare majus, et praeesset diei, et luminare minus, ut praeesset nocti: sunt enim duae jurisdictiones, spiritualis et temporalis. Jurisdictionem spirit. *principaliter* habet summus Pontifex, jurisdictionem temp. habet imperator et alii reges; tamen de omni temporali habet cognoscere summus Pontifex et judicare *ratione peccati*, etc. — Dicimus, quod in nullo volumus usurpare *jurisdictionem regis;* non potest negare rex seu quicunque alter fidelis, quin sit nobis *subjectus ratione peccati*." Cf. *du Puy*, p. 72 sq. It is more than likely that this bull was composed by *Ægidius of Rome*, also called Aegidius Colonna, Archbishop of Bourges. It is sometimes erroneously stated that he was an opponent of Boniface's (Austrian Quart. of Cath. Theol., Year I., 1862, n. 1. The remark of Gerson, an author usually found on the side of the bishops, is important in this connection. It is in Serm. de pace et unione Graecorum, and runs as follows: "Nec dicere oportet omnes reges vel principes haereditatem eorum vel terram tenere a Papa (something that Philip imputed to Boniface), ut Papa habeat superioritatem civilem, similem et juridicam super omnes, quemadmodum aliqui imponunt Bonifacio octavo. Omnes tamen homines, principes et alii, subjectionem habent ad Papam, in quantum eorum jurisdictionibus, temporalitatè et Dominio abuti vellent contra legem divinam et naturalem, et potest superioritas illa nominari potestas directiva et ordinativa potius quam civilis vel juridica."

[2] *Raynald.* ad an. 1302, nro. 12, subfin. *Mansi*, however, in his note, doubts if there were so many French prelates present. *Raynald.*, nro. 13, makes the following supposition respecting the origin of the bull "*Unam sanctam:*" Ex eo concilio videtur emanasse insignis constitutio—unam sanctam eccl. cath., etc. See this bull in Extrav. Commun., Lib. I., Tit. VIII., De majorit. and obed. c. I. (Tr.)

Peter. Christ has established two swords or powers in the Church—the one temporal, the other spiritual. The latter He has committed to the priesthood, the former to kings; and, both being in the Church, both have the same end. The temporal power, being inferior, is subject to the spiritual, which is the higher and more noble, and directs the former as the soul does the body. Should the temporal power turn aside from its prescribed course, it is the duty of the spiritual to recall it to its true destiny. It is of faith that all men, even kings, are subject to the Pope; for, if kings were not subject to the censures of the Church whenever they might sin in the exercise of the power committed to them, they would, as a consequence, be out of the Church, and the two powers would be essentially distinct, having, in that case, their origins in two different and opposite principles—an error not far removed from the heresy of the Manichaeans."

Such is the drift and the doctrinal contents of the oft-quoted and much-criticised bull in which Boniface designedly gives special prominence to the teaching of French writers and theologians, such as *St. Bernard*, *Hugo of St. Victor*, and *St. Thomas Aquinas*,[1] who, though not a Frenchman, was an authority in France on the relations between Church and State, of which this bull, and every other directed by this Pope to the French king, particularly treats.

---

[1] Two principal passages from *St. Bernard*, De consideratione, Lib. IV., c. 3; *ejusd.* ep. 256 ad Dom. papam Eugen.; from *Hugo of St. Victor*, De Sacramentis, Lib. II., Pt. II., c. 4.; from *St. Thomas Aquin.*, Contra errores Graecor. ad Urban. IV., P. M. sub finem, where the sentiment, quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis (in the bull of Pope Boniface: porro subesse sub Rom. Pontif. omnem humanam creaturam declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis). *Phillips*, in his Canon Law, Vol. III., p. 256, has pointed out the quotations from St. Bernard and Hugo of St. Victor, yet his own quotation is incorrect, and he has also forgotten to mark variations; for, whereas it is put in the bull *Unam sanctam*, "Ille (gladius) sacerdotis, is manu regis et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam (complacentiam) sacerdotis," it is said in *Bernard*, De consid., IV., 3: "Ille sacerdotis, is militis manu, sed sane ad nutum sacerdotis et *jussum imperatoris*." It is likewise put in the bull, "Spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet et judicare, si bona non fuerit;" whilst *Hugo of St. Victor* says: "Spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem et instituere habet *ut sit*, et judicare habet, si bona non fuerit." Yet *St. Bernard* also says: "Exercendus est nunc uterque gladius —— per vos. *Petri* uterque est, alter suo nutu, alter sua manu, quoties necesse est evaginandus.— Ergo suus erat ille, sed non manu sua utique educendus (epist. 256).

When Charles of Valois, who had previously been the recipient of many and considerable favors from the Pope, offered his kind offices as mediator between the French king, his brother, and Boniface, the latter sent Cardinal *John le Moine* of Amiens as his legate to Philip,[1] who, rejecting all overtures of accommodation proposed by the cardinal, was excommunicated, April 13, 1303. The bearer of the papal letters was met at Troyes by the king's officers, his documents taken from him, and he himself cast into prison. With a view to strengthening his position, Philip now concluded a peace with Edward of England; while, on the other hand, Boniface adjusted the difficulties between Charles II. of Naples and Frederic of Sicily, and, after considerable hesitation, recognized *Albert of Austria* as lawful King of Germany, and invited him to come to Italy and receive the imperial crown. In reply, Albert wrote a very respectful and submissive note, in which he disclaimed any feeling of opposition to the Holy See.

In June, 1303, Philip again convoked the three estates of his kingdom at Paris. *William de Plasian*, supported by four barons, appeared before this assembly with a long catalogue of complaints against the Pope, ingeniously arranged and worked up with consummate sophistry, to produce the very worst impression on his hearers. The substance of the document had evidently been supplied by the exiled members of the Colonna family. In it the charges of heresy, witchcraft, idolatry, disbelief, simony, and murder were brought against Boniface. The proof of his *heresy* consisted in that he had said, in a moment of irritation, that "he had rather be a dog than a Frenchman," denying by implication, it was urged, *the immortality of the soul;* of his *idolatry*, in that he had had his image engraven on some of his gifts to the churches, the conclusion being that he desired to have himself worshiped;

---

[1] On the *twelve articles* proposed by the cardinal as a basis of settlement, cf. *du Puy*, p. 89.

of his *disbelief*, in that he had, while Mass was being celebrated, turned his back upon the altar, thereby practically denying the Real Presence; of his *simony*, in that he had asserted the Pope could not be guilty of simoniacal practices, and had unlawfully disposed of the goods of the Church to the French king; of *murder*, in that a rumor had got abroad compromising him in the death of Celestine V.; of *magic*, in that, being possessed, he had heaped outrages upon the bishops and the religious orders of the Church, and was now persecuting France and pursuing the French king with the most implacable hatred. To the truth of these charges and the facts by which they were supported, De Plasian vouched on oath,[1] whereupon the deputies pledged their fortunes and their lives in defense of the liberties of France against the aggressions of Rome. *For the first time* in the history of France, king and people, high and low, "*appealed from the Pope to a general council,*" thus practically opening a schism. Of all the prelates and ecclesiastics present at that Gallican assembly, the abbot of Citeaux alone had the courage and the manliness to stand up and protest against proceedings so dishonest and violent.

William de Nogaret, the keeper of the royal seals, who had taken an active part in getting up the charges against the Pope, was sent into Italy, ostensibly as embassador, accompanied by *Sciarra Colonna*. Boniface, who had in the meantime received intelligence of what had taken place in France, held a consistory at *Anagni*, his native place, in which he deposed on oath that the crimes laid to his charge were utterly without foundation in fact. He next published (August 15th) five *bulls*,[2] in which he declared that a citation to Rome had its full effect, even if it should not actually have reached the person cited; suspended the power of ecclesiastical corporations to appoint to vacant prebends, and withdrew from the French universities the faculty of conferring academical degrees. He was about to lay France under interdict and absolve the subjects of Philip from their allegiance, when

---

[1] Cf. *Card. Wiseman* and *Döllinger*, ll. c. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *du Puy*, Preuves, p. 63, and *Raynald.*, ad an. 1303, nros. 36 sq.

William de Nogaret, at the head of a French force, and Sciarra Colonna, leading a band of Ghibellines, made their way, by treachery, into Anagni, and, rushing through the streets, cried out, "Long live the King of France! Death to Boniface!" The astonished and affrighted inhabitants could make no resistance, and the two bands forced their way, by different entrances, into the Pope's presence-chamber. In the meantime Boniface had hastily put on his pontifical vestments, and having seated himself upon his throne, and holding a crucifix in his hands, calmly awaited the approach of his enemies. Sciarra Colonna, thirsting for vengeance, was making for the Pope with drawn sword; but, catching sight of the venerable old man, he halted, abashed and irresolute, on the threshold of the chamber. William de Nogaret, who was a stranger to reverence, fine feeling, and generous instincts, rudely approached the Pope and insultingly threatened to carry him off a prisoner to Lyons and have him deposed by a general council. To this Boniface calmly replied, making ironical reference to Nogaret's father, who had been punished for heresy: "Here is my head, here is my neck. I, a Catholic, lawful Pontiff and Vicar of Jesus Christ, may patiently bear being condemned and deposed by the Patarini. I desire to die for the faith of Christ and His Church."[1]

After a three-days captivity, he was rescued by the inhabitants of Anagni, who, roused to action by the indignant words of Cardinal Luca del Fiesco, rushed to his release, crying, "*Death to the traitors!*" On his return to Rome, whither he went a few days later, he received a most extraordinary ovation. He was shortly attacked by a severe fever, of which he died on the tenth day after his return (October 11, 1303), in the eighty-seventh year of his age. After his return, it is said,[1] he was detained for a short time in honorable captivity by the Cardinals *Orsini*, who were indignant that they should have been suspected of complicity in the conspiracy against him.[2] It is not improbable that the shock of these two captivities may have accelerated the death of Boniface.

---

[1] This was proved in his "*process*." See *Raynald.*, l. c., and *Rubaeus*, p. 214. "This scene," says Cardinal Wiseman, "exhibits, beyond almost any other in history, the triumph of moral over brute force—the power of mind, arrayed in true dignity of outward bearing, over passion and injustice." Even *Dante* relented at its contemplation, and indignantly sang of his enemy:

"Veggio in Alagna entrar lo fiordaliso,
E nel Vicario suo Cristo esser catto.
Veggiolo un altra volta esser deriso;
Veggio rinnovellar l'aceto e 'l fele,
E tra nuovi ladroni essere anciso."

"Entering Alagna, lo! the fleur-de-lis,
And in his vicar, Christ a captive led!
I see him mocked a second time;—again
The vinegar and gall produced I see;
And Christ himself 'twixt living robbers slain."
[*Wright's Dante—Purgatory, Canto XX., lines* 86–90.

The opinions even of Catholics have been divided as to the character of this Pope. The Ghibelline poet, *Dante*, assailed him fiercely, calling him "the prince of modern Pharisees"[3] and "the high-priest whom may evil overtake;"[4] and St. Peter is made, by the same poet, to call him "an usurper," and to charge him with crime[5] and the shedding of blood; and, finally, he is represented as buried among the damned in hell for his guilt of simony.[6] On the other hand, *Petrarca* calls him "the marvel of the world," and the Protestant *Planck* has written a vindication of him. "Although," says Cardinal Wiseman, "the character of Boniface was certainly stern and inflexible, there is not a sign of its having been cruel or revengeful. Throughout the whole of his history, not an instance can be found of his having punished a single enemy with death. . . . Moreover, we do not find in any writer, however hostile to him, the slightest insinuation against his moral conduct or character, and this is not a little thing in one who has been more bitterly assailed than almost any other pontiff."[1]

---

[1] In the chronicles of *Parma* and those of *Ferretti* of Piacenza (*Muratori*, T. IX., pp. 848, 1006), but the latter is hardly reliable. (Tr.)

[2] *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 96. (Tr.)

[3] "Lo principe dei nuovi farisei." Inf. XXVII. 85.

[4] "Il gran prete a cui mal prenda." Inf. 68. This is regarded by the Italians as the very worst of imprecations. (Tr.)

[5] "Quegli che usurpa in terra il luogo mio
Il luogo mio, il luogo mio che vaca."
[*Parad. xxvii.* 22.

[6] Inf. XIX. 52.

That he was severely just, no one can fairly deny; but, on the other hand, it must be admitted that, as a strict *jurist*, not always taking into account the circumstances of his age, he often went too far in the assertion of rights which unquestionably belonged to him, forgetting that the most just claims, *when pushed to their extreme consequences*, may degenerate into wrongs.[2] But when we take into account the character of Boniface's adversaries, and the difficulty, at the dawning of a new era, of clearly apprehending and fully appreciating all the influences at work, and of providing for contingencies, we shall be inclined to moderate the severity of this judgment. Perhaps no Pope could have let the papacy down from the height reached by it in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with more safety and more imposing dignity than Boniface VIII.

§ 227. *General View of the Temporal and Spiritual Power of the Popes during the Middle Ages.*

Roskovány, de Primatu Rom. Pontif. ejusq. jurib. August. Vindel., 1854. Against the vague distinction, in vogue since Febronius, of *essential* and *accidental* (questionable) rights of the Primacy, cf. *Buss*, Influence of Christianity, in the *Freiburg Journal of Theol.*, Vol. IV., p. 269-289. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 179 sq.; Vol. V., Pt. I., and * *Walter*, C. L., 13 ed., § 446. *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. III., p. 51-149. **Contzen*, Critique of the Middle Ages, with a special reference to the Political Economy of St. Thomas Aquinas, Cassel, 1870. — Mgr. (Card.) *Matthieu*, le pouvoir temporel des papes.

Never did the spiritual and the temporal power of the Popes rise to a greater height or take a wider range than during the epoch over which we have just passed.[3] Look where we will, and we behold the Pope acting as mediator between princes and subjects, and governments and peoples; at one time passing judgment on kings and nations in the name and by the authority of God; at another, making a resolute stand against injustice, and preventing, as far as possible, the ravages of war and the anarchy of revolution. In the belief of all, he is *the immediate representative of God*, the Vicar of Jesus Christ (not only *vicarius Petri*, but also *Christi, Dei*), and responsible for the exercise of his authority *to God alone and His Church.*[1] He wears the triple crown to symbolize the Church militant, the Church suffering, and the Church triumphant, and as a token of an Empire superior to all the kingdoms of this world, and embracing in the range of its immensity[2] the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the places under the earth. High above every other banner rises the glorious banner of the Church—the banner of the Crucified Christ, *who is the direct object of the homage, the honor, and the obedience of all Christians.* Every law is promulgated *in Christ's name*, and observed *for His sake.* To contemn the visible Head of the Church is all one with contemning Him who is her invisible Head. To the primacy of the Popes does Rome owe all she is, and, in fact, that she now exists at all is nearly, if not altogether due to their presence. Had they at any time ceased to make it their abode, the malaria of the surrounding campagna would have dispersed the population, and the once proud mistress of the world would have become as desolate as Ephesus, and as politically and commercially insignificant as Syracuse, Agrigentum,or Corinth.

---

[1] *Card. Wisemann*, l. c. sub finem. (Tr.)

[2] The following judgment, passed on Boniface by his contemporary, *Ptolemaeus de Fiadonib.*, generally devoted to the Church (his hist. eccl., Lib. XXIV., c. 36), is remarkable: "Hic longo tempore experientiam habuit Curiae, quum primo Advocatus ibidem, inde factus postea Notarius Papae, postea Cardinalis, et inde in Cardinalatu expeditor ad casus Collegii declarandos. seu ad exteros respondendum. Nec in hoc habuit parem, sed propter hanc causam factus est fastuosus et arrogans ac omnium contemtivus." *Muratori.*, T. XI., p. 1203. Yet *Mansi*, in Raynaldi annal. ad an. 1303, judges him more mildly: "Ingentes animi dotes—saeculari principatui potius quam ecclesiastico potiores."

[3] See above § 191.

---

[1] Against the claim to a universal, despotic, and *absolute* power, said to have been made by the popes of the Middle Ages, cf. Paschal. II.: "Ad hoc in Ecclesia Dei constituti sumus, ut Ecclesiae ordinem et patrum debeamus praecepta servare." In *Mansi.*, T. XX., p. 1099: Innocentii III.: "In tantum mihi fides necessaria, ut cum de caeteris peccatis Deum judicem habeam, propter solum peccatum, quod in fidem committitur, possim ab *Ecclesia judicari.*" Cf. Greg. VII., Lib. V., ep. 11; Lib. VI., ep. 14. As regards subsequent popes, *Pius VII.* spoke as follows: "There are, in the very nature and constitution of the Church, certain limits which the Pope may not go beyond without doing violence to his conscience and abusing the power committed to him by Jesus Christ, to be used for the building up, and not the overturning of the Church. These limits are *the dogmas of Catholic faith*, which the Bishop of Rome can not violate, either directly or indirectly; and, even in the matter of discipline, there have always been certain bounds which the popes never ventured to overstep." Vide *Döllinger*, The Papacy and the States of the Church, Munich, 1861, p. 41 sq.

[2] The use of a crown is perhaps as ancient as the *temporal power* of the popes. The biographer of Alexander III. (1159–1181), (see *Pagi* in Brev. P. R.) relates of him: "Consecratus est in sumnum Pontificem, et secundum *solitum* ecclesiae morem *regno de more* insignitus, mitra *turbinata sc.* cum *corona.*" Pope Innocent III. (1198–1216) makes an explicit distinction between the papal crown and mitre: "Romanus Pontifex in signum Imperii utiter *regno*, et in signum Pontificii utitur *mitra.*" (Serm. in fest. s. Sylvest. P.) The name "*tiara*" is mentioned by Pandulphus in the life of Paschal II. (1099–1118). Writing of the enthronement of this Pope, he says: "Chlamyde coccinea induitur a patribus, et thiara capiti ejus imposita, comitante turba cum cantu Lateranum vectus," etc. *Pagi* (in Brev. R. P. in vita Alexandri III.) has an ancient list of the festivals "in quibus Dominus Papa solebat coranari." All this goes to show that the tiara was not then a "*Triregnum*," or "*triple crown.*" The common opinion is, that the second crown was added by Boniface VIII. (1294–1303) as a symbol of the spiritual and temporal power, and the third was by Pope Urban

The Infallibility of the Pope, now an article of faith, was then the generally received belief of Christians, and its witness then, as now, was the untainted purity of the Roman faith.[1] Some of those who took upon them the defense of the doctrine brought to its support many genuine, and not a few *suspicious* passages from the Fathers[2]—notably from the so-called "Thesaurus St. Cyrilli;" but the schoolmen much preferred arguments drawn from texts of Holy Writ[3] and deductions from dogmatic premises on the nature, unity, and end of the Church—a line of reasoning perfectly in keeping with scholastic methods of thought.

The episcopate of the Pope, being *one* and coextensive with the Church, was regarded as the origin and source of all epis-

---

V. (1362–1379), for mystical reasons. Ancient portraits of the popes confirm this statement. *Aleman*, in diss. de parietinis Lateranensibus, and *M. A. Mazzaroni*, De tribus coronis Pont. Mas. (Romae, 1609.) *Schrödl*, in Freibg. Cyclop. art. *Tiara.* The use of this triple crown in *all* ages of the Church, as implied by *Darras* in his Ch. Hist., can not be sustained. (Tr.)

[1] See Vol. I., § 30. — Cf. Luke xxii. 32.

[2] Thus, for example, at the passage quoted, at page 625, by St. Thomas Aquinas—"Quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis,"—is added, "Dicit enim *Cyrillus* (Alex. Patriarcha) in libro thesaurorum," a work written in imitation of the genuine one of St. Cyril, and having the same title, but whose author was probably a Dominican.

[3] Matt. xvi., Luke xxii., John x. 16 and xxi.

copal power; and hence, since the eleventh century, bishops have been in the habit of styling themselves bishops "*by the grace of God and through favor of the Apostolic See:*"[1] They were, as a rule, elected by cathedral chapters; and their elections, or their translation from inferior to more important sees, always required the approbation of the Pope. Archbishops, according to long-established usage, *generally* received the pallium, and enjoying as *metropolitans*, in a special sense, a share in the solicitude of the Head of the Church, were required to take an *oath of fidelity* to the Pope.[2] Without the authorization of the Pope, new episcopal sees could not be established, nor could the administration or the boundaries of old ones be changed. The Pope alone could validly *convoke* councils and *confirm* their acts, and, for good and sufficient reasons, reserved to himself the *right of canonization.*[3] He at times claimed the right *to propose* deserving ecclesiastics *for benefices* (*precistae*), and himself conferred the investiture;[4] and, in extreme cases, he even *laid a general tax* upon the whole church of a particular country. Appeals were constantly made to him in affairs both secular and ecclesiastical. He reserved to himself all manner of *dispensations* and *absolution from certain grievous sins.* This latter was freely granted to such as made pilgrimages to Rome.

So wide an extension and so active an exercise of the power and authority of the Holy See called for a large and efficient staff of officials about the immediate person of the Pope, and the continual presence of papal legates in distant countries. For the decisions in all legal matters, the *Roman court* was the highest tribunal of appeal, and for these legal services heavy fees were exacted. The *legates* sent into the various countries to look after ecclesiastical affairs, as a rule, made an honest and conscientious use of the vast authority with which they were invested; but the abuses which they not unfrequently permitted themselves excited the most bitter complaints even against the Popes, who, to their honor be it said, always meant well, but were not always faithfully served.[1]

---

[1] Histoire littér. de la France, T. I., p. 253–259. Cf. *Thomassini*, T. I., Lib. I., c. 69, nros. 9, 10. Cf. *The Catholic*, 1823, Vol. VII., p. 129–148.

[2] According to the acts of the Council of Rome, in the year 1079, the oath was taken by the patriarch of Aquileia. *Mansi.*, T. XX., p. 525.

[3] *Alex. III.* (Decretal. Greg., Lib. I., Tit. 45, c. 1.) *Innoc. III.* extended it to relics. Conc. Lateran. IV. a. 1215, can. 62. Cf. *Benedicti XIV.* De servor. Dei beatificat. et beator. canonisat. (Opp. omn., Rom. 1747, Vol. 1–4.)

[4] *Thomassini*, T. II., Lib. I., c. 43, 44: De initio et progressu juris vel exercitii juris summor. pontificum in beneficia dioecesium aliarum. Cf. *Hurter*, l. c., Vol. III., p. 105–111, and p. 123 sq.

The wide-extending influence of the Popes, embracing both secular and ecclesiastical interests, so well expressed in the form of benediction given by the Vicar of Christ to Christendom ("*Urbi et Orbi*"), and the large range of rights and prerogatives attached to the Primacy, have frequently been a source of embarrassment to historians in instituting a comparison between the papacy in the early ages and what it came to be as time went on. But the comparison will embarrass only those who considered the Church and her institutions as the sterile abstractions of a purely human system. It can seem strange to none but those disposed to be hypercritical and narrow-minded, that the papacy should be found, in the Middle Ages not exactly what it was in the first centuries of the Church. While finding fault with the papacy on this score, they forget or overlook the fact that the episcopacy in like manner went on developing and widening the sphere of its influence as the exigencies of each successive age demanded, until it finally included within its circumference the full scope of metropolitan rights. The Primacy, being the keystone of the imposing edifice of the Church, proves, by its continual growth and varying adaptation to the needs of successive generations, its title to legitimacy. The seed of Divinity, sown in the soil of the Church, sprang up, expanded, and gained strength and vigor as centuries went on. Its growth kept pace with the constantly increasing *wants of the times, was called forth, and in a sense nurtured by them*, and was adequate to them. The Primacy increased in greatness and power in proportion as the tendency to unity and centralization was developed in the Church. The phases and manifestations of ecclesiastical unity vary in different ages and under diverse circumstances. In times of peace they are more or less in abeyance; but when trouble comes and storms threaten, the Church gathers all her scattered energies for the struggle, and puts forth her full strength in the *Primacy*.

---

[1] We refer, above all, to *Alex.* IV., ep. encyclica ad archiepiscopos Galliae: "Sicut ad audientiam nostram non sine animi perturbatione pervenit, horum (Legatorum) nonnulli famae prodigi et salutis obliti—occasione procurationum hujusmodi a nonnullis ecclesiis et ecclesiast. personis—magnas et immoderatas pecuniarum summas extorquere *ausu sacrilego* praesumserunt, diversas excommunicationum, suspensionum et interdicti sententias in quam plures ex personis et ecclesiis—temere promulgando in animarum suarum periculum, nostram et dictae sedis infamiam et scandalum plurimorum, etc." (De *Marca,* Concord sacerd. et imp., Lib. V., c. 51, § 14.)

The popes of the Middle Ages, acting from purely Christian motives, and not from a sense of personal power, exercised their authority the more effectually, inasmuch as they were conscious that the principles on which it rested were identical with those enunciated and drawn out by the early Fathers of the Church, and notably by St. Cyprian.[1]

The power and action of the Church are always abreast of her needs; and although the *rights* and prerogatives of the Primacy may be *more or less nearly connected with its direct aim and scope*, still the distinction which has been drawn between *rights essential and non-essential to its nature* is vague and indefinite; for it not unfrequently happens that those which are regarded as non-essential in one age become in another *the most vital* to the preservation and advancement of the Church.

The judgments passed by some upon the possession and exercise of *the temporal sovereignty* by the popes are characterized by a tone of unusual severity. But unprejudiced inquirers, who had no purpose to subserve but the ascertaining of the truth, and who brought to the investigation critical sobriety and honesty, have gratefully acknowledged that the political and moral *supremacy*, and, in certain instances, *suzerainty*[2] asserted and exercised by the Head of the Church, not as his inherent and absolute right, but in part *the result of circumstances*, and in part conceded to him by the common voice of Christendom, was, for those ages of violence and lawlessness, a beneficent disposition of an all-wise and overseeing Providence. It was, in some sort, the necessary result of the peculiar circumstance attending the introduction of Christianity among the Germanic nations.[1] Everything in the history of their conversion tended to weld together the interests of Church and State, and to develop *a system of theocracy.* The missionaries who preached Christianity among them were sent *from Rome*, their bishops were united *to Rome*, their Christian empire received its sanction *from Rome, and was bound to the Apostolic See by innumerable ties;* and finally, *their emperors and their kings were crowned by the popes.* Under such circumstances, it is no matter of surprise that the Pope became the lawgiver to kings and nations, the guide who conducted both along the way that leads to God, and the counselor who reminded them of their duties when they deviated from them, and of their obligations when they violated or showed a disposition to shirk them. What was a *political prerogative* during the Middle Ages has remained a *moral right* ever since, and will continue so until the Church ceases to exist; for, morally speaking, *the Pope is an abiding lawgiver to Christendom.* But it is to be noted that it was not theologians who during the Middle Ages *recognized* and formulated the rights of papal sovereignty, but *jurists and schools of law.* The mediaeval popedom was incontestably the

---

[1] All the churches, when menaced from within or attacked from without, turn their eyes *ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, because it is to her that Christ has delivered the keys, *ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem.*

[2] It has been frequently shown, in the course of the history of the papacy from 1073 to 1303, that the popes neither asserted a "*universal suzerainty*" over

---

Christendom nor represented the temporal power as an emanation from the spiritual. Cf. supra, p. 591, n. 1; p. 574, n. 2; p. 624, n. 1. When such claims were put forward, as in the instance of the heritage of Mathilda in Tuscany, the Norman conquests in Southern Italy, and the kingdoms of England and Portugal, they were based on treaties, the validity of which could not be contested. But when popes put forward unsupported claims, as when *Martin IV.* asserted his right over the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia, they were dismissed with as little concern, and just as peremptorily, as if made by secular princes to territories belonging to their neighbors. Cf. *Bianchi*, Della podestà e della polizia della chiesa, T. I. passim.

[1] Cf. *Bonn*, Philosophical and Theological *Review*, year 1844, nro. 4, p. 40 sq.; *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. III., p. 66 sq., and *Boehmer*, Dissert. de varia decret.. Grat. fortuna, in his Corpus Juris, Tom. I.

outgrowth of those times—a peculiar phase of the papacy which passed away with the age and circumstances that gave it life and form, while the essential elements of the papacy remained unimpaired, without loss or accession. And, in matter of fact, the political supremacy of the popes has disappeared since the thirteenth century. From this time forward the *states-general* commenced to take a more definite shape, to assert a greater measure of independence, and to embody national rights in *well-defined constitutions.* These political assemblies, as they grew in strength and organization, gradually superseded the papacy in resisting the power of princes.

In preceding centuries, the clergy, and preëminently the Pope, were alone possessed of dignity and authority, while these attributes were conspicuously absent in every other class of men. Strong by virtue of their high mission, the popes opposed a courageous resistance to popular passion on the one hand, and on the other fearlessly raised their voice against the vices of kings and the insolence of nobles. Their superior knowledge, their spirit of conciliation, their pacific mission, and the very nature of their interests necessarily inspired them with grand and generous ideas in politics, such as neither the nobles nor the commoners were then capable of grasping and appreciating. It has been too long the fashion, in our text-books of history, to represent the Church's power during the Middle Ages as an intolerable tyranny, and the secular princes who opposed it as the great champions of popular freedom. The case was precisely the reverse. Nations were oscillating between the tyranny of a powerful ruler and the intolerable oppression of feudalism. *The Church,* and she *alone,* gained them their freedom. Without the protection of bishops and popes, cities could not have obtained the large franchises which, by their powerful intervention, they secured. The clergy, possessing all the education, literary culture, and refinement of those times, were public-spirited and devoted to the popular cause. This tendency to democratic principles was but natural in a body of men whose ranks were for the most part recruited from the lower orders. Who but the sons of honest artisans and peasants, with miters upon their heads and crosiers in their hands, would have had the courage to resist reckless princes and semi-barbarous feudal lords?

If popes, at times, in the exercise of their power over nations, went beyond the legitimate limits of their authority, their excesses were promptly condemned by the bulk of the people, who, however, while doing so, did not lose sight of, or fail to gratefully acknowledge the blessings of papal arbitration. "If there existed in Europe," says Chateaubriand, "a tribunal *to judge* nations and monarchs *in the name of God*, and to prevent wars and revolutions, this tribunal would doubtless be a master-piece of policy and the very height of social perfection. The popes, by the influence they exercised over the Christian world, were on the point of effecting this object."[1] The same truth is expressed by *Ancillon* in the following words: "In the whole range of ideas," says he, "capable of being embodied in visible form, I know of none greater than that of setting up a representative of religion and morality, raised high above nations and kings, to whose spiritual power appeal may be constantly made from the injustice of brute force."

The wide influence and universal consideration enjoyed by the popes had unquestionably been long favored and strengthened by the false decretals of Isidore and the collection of laws made by *Yves, Bishop of Chartres.*[2] The prestige thus acquired was still further increased by the celebrated Benedictine, *Gratian* of Chiusi in Tuscany, who, by his zealous labors, did for canon law what *Irnerius* had already done for civil, and *Peter Lombard* for scholastic theology. Gratian, when he published (c. A. D. 1151) his celebrated manual of ecclesiastical law, was a professor in the cloister-school of St. Felix, at Bologna. The work, which is entitled "*Decretum Gratiani*," and is divided into three parts,[3] was, before publication, submitted to the judgment of the most learned professors of law at Bologna. He arranged in scientific order all the laws in force in his time, explained each subject in turn by an introduction on the general principles of law pertinent to the matter in hand, and developed the text by a running commentary.

---

[1] *Chateaubriand*, Génie du Christianisme, T. IV., Chap. XI (Politique et gouvernement. Cf. *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 420.

[2] *Yves'* lesser collection, in eight books, Panormia ed. *Melchior* de *Vosmediano*, Lovan. 1557. More complete collection, in seventeen books, Decretum in opp. ed. *Fronto*, Paris, 1647, 2 T. fol. *Theiner*, "On the supposed Decretum of Yves," raises strong doubts on the authenticity of this Decretum. Mentz, 1832. *Walter*, C. L., 13 ed., p. 241-245.

[3] The three parts are: 1. *De Personis*, divided into 101 distinctiones; 2. *De judiciis ecclesiasticis* eorumque ordine, divided into 36 causas; 3. *De consecratione*, divided into 5 (not 7) distinctiones. The first part treats of the hierarchal constitution of the Church, and relates chiefly to doctrinal and moral subjects.

Ecclesiastical law, to which heretofore little or no attention had been given, began now to be so generally studied and to exercise so wide an influence that it threatened to supersede civil law at the universities, and even forced itself upon the consideration of emperors, who were in consequence obliged to have among their retinue some doctors of canon law.

Gratian, like Justinian in a former age, had many glossarists.[1] The *Decretum Gratiani* is, on the whole, an indifferent compilation, containing indeed abundant proof of the compiler's familiarity with the character and genius of his subject-matter, but giving no satisfactory explanation of the conflicting statements to be found in the older and more modern ecclesiastical law. These difficulties rendered a number of new decisions necessary, which the Dominican *Raymond of Pennaforte*, by order of *Gregory IX.*, collected and arranged in *systematic* form, somewhat after the manner of the Code of Justinian. (Decretalium Gregorii IX., Lib. V., A. D. 1234.) The subjects treated of in its five books are indicated by the well-known hexameter, "*Judex, judicium, clerus, connubia, crimen.*" This compilation served as a basis for the subsequent collection of Pope Boniface VIII. (Liber sextus Bonifacii VIII., also arranged in five books), published about the close of the early half of the present epoch. By the publication of Boniface's collection, the *Decretum Gratiani*, which is critically of little value, and, as a rule, can claim no authority beyond what the documents therein contained intrinsically possess, gradually passed into disuse.[2] Cf. infra, § 268 sub fin., for those contributions to the body of canon law which were added after the publication of the Liber sextus, viz., Libri V. *Clementinarum*, and the *Twenty Extravagantes* of Pope John XXII., and the *Extravagantes Communes*, which are the production of various popes, from Urban IV. to Sixtus IV.

The second treats of external jurisdiction, and the third, of the inner life of the Church—i. e., the *liturgy* and *the sacraments*. (Tr.) The full title, which is, however, of later origin, is "*Concordantia discordantium Canonum*," Libri III. For the literature relating to this subject, see *Walter*, C. L., 13 ed.

[1] *Guido Pancirolus*, De claris leg. interpretibus, Lps. 1721, 4to. The most important is *Joan. Semeca*, provost of Halberstadt, magister Teutonicus († 1343). Cf. *Walter* and *Maassen.*

[2] On the decretals of Gregory IX. and Boniface VIII. lib. sextus, see *Walter*, l. l., p. 245-251. *Maassen*; *Buss*, Freiburg Review of Theol., Vol. IV., p. 298.

CHAPTER II.

THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE HIERARCHY—ADMINISTRATION OF DIOCESES.

§ 228. *The Clergy in their Relations to the State.*

The violent conflicts between Church and State produced their legitimate results. Without a conflict, there is no victory. Feudalism and its innumerable fetters were among the greatest obstacles to the progress and freedom of the Church. The feudal lords generally claimed that the *royalties* and *right of spoil* (*jus regaliae, jus spolii seu exuviarum*), so burdensome to the Church, were rights which justly belonged to them by reason of their position.[1] In *Germany alone* did the popes succeed in abolishing these rights. By what was called the *jus primarum precum*, the feudal lords long retained an influence in nominations to ecclesiastical benefices. It required the full exercise of papal authority to shield and protect the clergy against the arbitrary and violent exactions of the temporal power. Among their ablest and boldest champions were *Urban II.*, in the council of Clermont (can. 2), and *Alexander III.*, in the third council of Lateran (can. 19) After the publication of the decree of Innocent III. in the fourth council of Lateran (A. D. 1215, can. 46), and of the bull "*Clericis laicos*" of Boniface VIII., the clergy were not allowed to make any but *voluntary* contributions, and these only in urgent cases, and subject always to the will of the Pope.

---

[1] The right, *jus spolii*, by which sovereigns claimed succession to the property of deceased priests and bishops—to so much, at least, as they had derived from their ecclesiastical benefices. The ancient canons forbade ecclesiastics to dispose by will of any but their patrimonial goods. These canons were by degrees relaxed, on account of the many lawsuits which arose from the difficulty of distinguishing between ecclesiastical and patrimonial property. Later abuses called for a renewal of the ancient discipline. We learn from Matthew of Paris (ad an. 1246) that three archdeacons in England had amassed great wealth in money and sacred vessels of silver and gold, and that two of them dying intestate, their great possessions, which ought to have passed to the poor or to the service of the Church, were claimed and obtained by their lay relatives. The evil was not much remedied when sovereigns seized, for their own purposes, the property left at their deaths by bishops and priests. *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 28, Eng. transl., note of the translator, Rev. Dr. Cox. (Tr.)

The clergy also made an effort to regain their ancient *immunities*, particularly those of the *forum*, in personal suits at law. But here the claims of feudal lords occasioned frequent collisions between ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction. In spite of the menaces of popes and councils, ecclesiastics still continued to be dragged before secular tribunals; but this clashing of the spiritual jurisdiction with the secular had at least the effect of making the punishment of churchmen more commensurate with their offenses. The domain within which the higher clergy exercised a civil jurisdiction grew daily more extensive, and their exercise of it steadily more beneficial. To their equitable administration of justice is to be ascribed the enactment of laws—some enjoining the observance of the *Peace of God*, and others directed against piracy, arson, tournaments, usury, and arbitrary taxation—by which the public peace and municipal order were far better preserved than in these days of police, with its many facilities for correcting lawlessness and repressing vice.

The energy displayed by the clergy in political affairs created a *spirit of public enterprise*, which manifested itself in the formation of *guilds*, the foundation of charitable institutions, such as orphan-asylums (orphanotrophia), foundling-houses (brephotrophia), hospitals for the sick (nosocomia), homes for the aged and infirm (gerontocomia), and free hospices for the entertainment of strangers (xenodochia). They also took the precaution to found *pest-houses for lepers* (leprosoria), which, at a time when the same attention was not given as at present to public sanitary measures, checked the spread of the terrible malady brought from the East into Europe by the crusaders.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Wührer*, on the beneficent influence of the Church in the Middle Ages (*Pletz*, New Theolog. Journal, year IV., 1831, Vol. I., p. 227 sq.); *Hurter*, Vol. IV, p. 454 sq. The *same*, on the Christian Institutions of Charity at the end

The clergy, in order to justify their steadily increasing influence, appealed to *the right of the Church to interfere in civil affairs, when and in so far as these came within the domain of morals and might be an occasion of sin, or when the parties themselves invoked her intervention as arbitrator.*[1] But, as every act of injustice, when considered from a Christian point of view, is sinful, it followed that in proportion as an age became *Christian,*[2] the influence of the clergy widened.

The preference of the people to seek justice from ecclesiastical rather than secular tribunals was not unfrequently a source of warm and animated disputes between clerical and lay judges, in the course of which the latter showed a disposition to forget that they had been taught jurisprudence by the clergy. Thus, for example, by a decree of the *fourth council of Lateran* (ecumenical) it was enacted that, instead of the summary and arbitrary methods of procedure heretofore in use in lay courts of justice,[3] a carefully written and detailed process should be substituted. In the course of time this was adopted in all secular tribunals. The Suabian code says, expressly, "that all the principles of law and right in use in civil and ecclesiastical courts of justice have been taken from the Decretum Gratiani and the decretals of Gregory IX."

The Church exercised a specially beneficent influence in favor of that class of mankind on whom feudalism bore most heavily. She never ceased to offer the most determined opposition to slavery,[4] and to soften its hardships,[5] by appealing

---

of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries (*Tübg. Quart.* 1842, p. 226–250). *Hefele,* Influence of Christianity on public spirit (Supplem. to Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 175–211).

[1] *Denunciatio evangelica.* according to St. Matt. xviii. 17.

[2] Cf. Decretal. Greg. IX., Lib. II., Tit. I., c. 13; the chapter is summed up thus: "Judex ecclesiast. potest per viam *denunciationis evangelicae* seu judicibilis procedere contra quemlibet peccatoram etiam laicum, maxime ratione perjurii vel pacis fractae."

[3] *Concil. Lateran. IV.,* can. 38. Cf. *Hefele,* Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 797.

[4] The *Conc. Londin.* ann. 1102, under *St. Anselm of Canterbury,* most emphatically forbids it: "Ne quis nefarium illud negotium, quo hactenus solebant in Anglia homines sicut bruta animalia venumdari, deinceps ullatenus facere praesumat."

[5] Greg. IX. severely reprimanded some Polish nobles who set their serfs to watch falcons' nests and cruelly punished them if the young were permitted to

to man's better instincts, and by showing how that all men are brothers by being created in the image of God and redeemed by the blood of His Son. She commanded bishops to protect the serfs of their dioceses against the violence of the lords, and procured the freedom of countless numbers of them, particularly when their masters were on the point of death, by representing their manumission (*manumissio per testamentum*) as a most acceptable work of Christian charity (*in remedium animae, pro amore Dei*), and by conducting the ceremony before the altar, thus surrounding it with the sacred *solemnity* of a religious rite. Finally, the Church gave the most noble examples of generous disinterestedness by renouncing many worldly advantages which she might have retained; by securing to the serfs engaged in domestic service such rights as changed their condition to that of free servants, and to those occupied in tilling the fields the privilege of becoming hereditary tenants or perpetual leaseholders, with the obligation of paying trifling but *fixed* sums annually, called *jura dominicalia.* But these classes, being regarded as in a certain sense born to their condition, could not dissolve at will their relations with their feudal lords.

The Church furthermore removed from her legislation the *irregularity* arising from defect of freedom. Bishops freely received into their seminaries the sons of serfs who gave evidence of talent and capacity, where they were educated for the ecclesiastical state, and prepared to occupy, as not unfrequently happened, the highest offices of the Church.[1]

Including within the compass of her sublime unity men of every rank and condition of life, she, and she alone, was able

---

escape. He says: "Animas fidelium, *quas Christus redemit sanguine*, avium intuitu et ferarum Satanae praedam effici detestabile decernimus et iniquum." Regesta *Greg.* in *Raumer's* Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. V., p. 16.

[1] When Béla, king of Hungary (A. D. 1266), rejected a bishop because he was born a serf, *Clement IV.* wrote to him: "Pro nihilo reputanda esse haec discrimina, quae inter homines commenta est humana imprudentia imparesque esse voluit, quos Deus coaequaverat—hominum voluntate praescribi non potuisse contra naturum, quae hominum genus omni *libertate* donavit." However, the Church always sustained the principle enounced—e. g., in decretis Hungarorum, in *Mansi.*, T. XXIII., p. 1184: "Nullum servum in clericum ordinetis, *nisi dominus ejus eum manumittat*, ut de caetero ex toto nihil in eo juris habeat."

to break down the barriers and to bridge over the great distances separating one class of society from another, and thus to bring together in the same state and for the same service the sons of serfs and the scions of kings.

§ 229. *The Cardinals* (*cf. supra*, § 194).

The *cardinals*, occupying a position immediately about the Pope's person, and being intimate with his affairs, acquired daily more and more the character of confidential advisers.[1] But they were not the *only* persons of whom he took counsel. Quite the contrary. When matters of grave importance were under consideration, he took the opinions of all the archbishops and bishops who chanced to be present in Rome at the time, and not unfrequently called in men distinguished by ability and prudence from every country of Christendom.[2] But the office of cardinal became one of prime importance afrer Nicholas II., Alexander III., and Gregory X. had committed to them the right of electing the Pope *in the name of the whole clergy* and the universal Church, and for this reason the Sacred College has among its members representatives from the three highest orders of the clergy—viz., *bishops*, *priests*, and *deacons*.

They were ordinarily selected from men still in the prime of life and the full vigor of manhood, who had already given evidence of their capacity and trustworthiness in the management of important affairs, either in the city of Rome itself, in legations, or, as sometimes happened, in administering the provinces belonging to the patrimony of St. Peter.

---

[1] In *Otto Frising.*, I. 17, they say of themselves: "Per cardinales universalis ecclesiae volvitur axis." Cf. above, p. 344, n. 1. Later on, also *Sixtus V.*, in the Constitut. "*Postquam*," dated 1585, says of them: "Cum ipsi veri cardinales sint in templo Dei bases."

[2] *Celestine III.* writes to the English bishops: "Unde sacrosancto Rom. ecclesia, cui Dominus super caeteras contulit magistratum, pium ad alias materna provisione respectum providit ab initio, et laudabili hactenus consuetudine custodivit, ut de diversis mundi partibus ad earum ministerium implendum viros prudentes assumeret, quorum auctoritas et doctrina sub Romani pontificis moderamine constituta, quod ipse non poterat, procul distantibus ecclesiis ministraret." *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 602.

At the Thirteenth Ecumenical Council, the first of Lyons (A. D. 1245), Innocent IV. gave them permission to wear the *scarlet hat*, as commemorative of the violent deaths of their martyred predecessors. Their dress, which is also scarlet, is intended to be emblematic of their senatorial rank, but more particularly to remind them that they should be at any time ready to shed their blood in the cause of truth and religion. Paul II., in the fifteenth century, added the red *berretta*, and ordered them to use scarlet caparisons for their horses whenever they rode out. Urban VIII. conferred upon them the title of *Eminence*, and permitted them to ornament their carriages and coaches of state with scarlet tassels. During the season of Lent, the cardinal's dress is violet—emblematic of penance—and also on the death of a relative or friend, as a sign of mourning. On *Gaudete* and *Laetare* Sundays, when the penitential season is half over, it is a light rose-color; and on Holy Saturday, the eve of Easter, when colors emblematic of joy are resumed, a mixture of purple and violet. As they should have all the qualifications of bishops, and have in reality greater responsibilities, they also receive from the Pope a *ring*, consisting of a large *sapphire*, emblematic of fidelity, enchased in plain gold, and bearing the papal arms. The first person to receive this ring, so far as historical records inform us, was Cardinal Cajetanus, who received it from his uncle, Pope Boniface VIII., in 1294. It may ever be worn, except during the Triduum of Holy Week.[1]

During the *early half* of this epoch, the popes, in their selection of cardinals, gave little ground for the charge of *nepotism*, the candidates being, as a rule, men who deserved well of the Church. Some had distinguished themselves as intelligent restorers and embellishers of houses of worship, others as scholars, others as authors, and others as capable legates.[2] Toward the close of the thirteenth century, the preference of the reigning popes for Frenchmen as cardinals commenced to work mischief by fostering a partisan spirit in the Sacred College.

---

[1] These particulars relative to the dress of a cardinal have been added by the translator. (TR.)

[2] Cf. *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. III., p. 150 sq., especially 160–176.

§ 230. *Administration of Dioceses.*

The change introduced into the mode of life of *cathedral chapters* was not without its influence on the position of bishops. The canonical mode of community life had in general ceased to be practiced, and, after the eleventh century, chapters had the administration of their own property. The efforts of *Yves of Chartres*, of *Altman of Passau*, of *St. Norbert of Magdeburg*, and *Ruthard of Mentz*, to restore canonical life[1] were fruitless.[2] The canons (*principes minores*) obtained a share of episcopal power, and, by the *Concordat of Worms*, *the exclusive right of electing bishops.*[3] They sometimes made use of this right to propose their own terms to candidates for the episcopal office, to which the latter were obliged to subscribe. On the death of a bishop, *they administered the diocese until another was appointed.* After the thirteenth century, the chapters themselves passed statutes for their own government, elected their own members, and determined their number (*capitula clausa*). They usually gave a preference to *nobles*, and sometimes conferred upon a single person[4] a plurality of prebends, thus resuscitating simony in another form. According to the testimony of *Geroh* of Reichersberg, some of the canons hired substitutes (*conductitii*) to chant the office. The popes complained loudly of these derelictions of duty;

---

[1] See above, p. 351.

[2] See the complaints of the decay of community life, particularly in *Gerhohus*, De corrupto Ecclesiae statu (*Baluz.* Miscellan., and *Galland.* Biblioth., T. XIV.)

[3] As to elections of bishops, cf. *Staudenmaier*, Hist. of Episcopal Elections, and *Hurter*, l. c., Vol. III., p. 219 sq.

[4] *Thomassini*, T. II., Lib. I., c. 36, nr. 10–17. Cf. *Dürr*, Diss. de capitul. claus. (*Schmidt*, Thesaur juris eccl., Tom. III., nr. 5, p. 122 sq.) The chapter of Strasburg, in the year 1232, rose up in an insolent manner against the ordinance of *Gregory IX.* Decretal. Lib. III., Tit. V., cap. 37: "Consuetudinem antiquam inviolabiliter observatam, juxta quam nullum nisi *nobilem* et *liberum* et ab *utroque parente illustrem* in suum consortium admiserunt." But the Pope interdicted this *custom*, saying: "Quod non generis, sed virtutum nobilitas, vitae honestas, gratum Deo faciant." And the same pope (February 20, 1228) prescribed for the diocese of *Choire:* "Ut nullus ecclesiae Curiensis canonicus de proventibus praebendae suae sive quotannis distributionibus percipiat in memorata ecclesiae nisi personaliter resideat et deserviat in eadem."

and, all things considered, it may be regarded as a great blessing to the Church that, from Alexander III. onward, the popes reserved to themselves the right of appointing to the most important *prelatures.* The highest dignitary of a chapter was the *Provost of the Cathedral* (praepositus), or the *Dean.* Some chapters had both, and in that case the Provost had precedence; but in France there was generally but one—the Dean.

Between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, the pretensions of the *archdeacons* grew so excessive that they endeavored to exercise their authority independently of the bishops, and, without consulting them, sometimes passed sentence of excommunication on individuals and laid districts[1] under interdict. Both bishops and chapters, in order to put an end to these assumptions,[2] appointed, in place of archdeacons, persons who were at first called *episcopal officials* (*officiales*), and afterward *vicars* (*vicarii*).[3] By a decree of the fourth council of Lateran, the office of a *penitentiary*, who was the bishop's representative *in foro interno*,[1] was provided for.

---

[1] *Gregor.* IX. decretal., Lib. I., Tit. XXIII., de officio Archidiad., c. 1: "Ut Archidiaconus post Episcopum sciat, se vicarium ejus esse in omnibus." The archdeacons often considered the jurisdictio delegata as the jurisdictio ordinaria. See *Thomassini*, T. I., Lib. II., c. 20, nr. 6–9. Then it is said, nro. 10: "His contumeliis exulcerati Episcopi novos et Vicarios et Officiales sibi adscivere, sed et Archidiaconos vetuere, ne quam jurisdictionis partem exercerent," etc. Cf. *Hurter*, Vol. III., p. 361–364, and *Binterim*, Memorabilia, Vol. VIII., Pt. I.

[2] The history of their abolition is veiled in obscurity, and the time of their suppression uncertain. The most ancient canon against them was enacted at the synod of Laval, in the year 1242. Can. 4: "Statuimus, ut archidiaconi et alii de causis matrimonialibus, simoniae vel de aliis, quae degradationem vel amissionem beneficii vel depositionem exigant, *nisi ex speciali mandato sui pontificis* nullatenus cognoscere vel definire praesumant, nec officiales habere, excepto civitatis archidiacono, qui alios officiales habere consuevit," etc., in *Mansi.*, T. XXIII., p. 551.

[3] Cf. *Pertsch*, Essay on the origin of archdeacons, archidiaconal jurisdiction, episcopal officials and vicars, and their difference, Hildesheim, 1743. Cf. *Gregor.* Decretal., Lib. I., Tit. XXV., c. 4–10. *Peter Cantor* distinguishes, in his Verbum Abbreviatum, c. 24, tria genera officialium: 1. Confessor, cui Episcopus vices suas in spiritualibus, in audiendis confessionibus et curandis animabus committit; 2. Quaestor palatii sui, decanus, archipresbyter et hujusmodi, qui incrementis et profectibus causarum et negotiorum Episcopi per fas et nefas invigilant; 3. Praepositus ruralis primus. By the names of *quaestor* and *praepositus* he designates those who executed the penal jurisdiction of the bishops, and who, later on, were in a more restricted sense called *officiales.*

After the Christians of the Holy Land had lost all their possessions, a number of Eastern bishops, being forced to seek refuge in Europe, became *auxiliary* bishops in some dioceses, but only in purely *episcopal* functions (*vicarii in pontificalibus*). They retained the titles of their lost bishoprics (in partibus infidelium), and were quite numerous,[2] being called bishops-*titular* or bishops-*vicar*. After a time, they likewise obtained a share in the administration of dioceses.[3]

§ 231. *The Morals of the Clergy.*

Cf. *Hurter*, Hist. of Innocent III. and his Contemporaries, Vol. III., p. 401–426.

About the close of the preceding epoch, and onward from the pontificate of Leo IX., earnest and energetic, but ineffectual efforts were made to purify the morals of ecclesiastics; but to restore the clergy to their former honesty of life, to raise them to their ancient dignity, and to enforce the primitive rule of celibacy, required a man of the stern character and iron will of Gregory VII. That the successors to Gregory, and the councils held after his time, continued to pursue immoral ecclesiastics as persistently and as relentlessly as he had done, may be inferred from the severity and number of the decrees passed against *concubinae, focariae, pedissequae.*

Innocent III., believing with the Apostle that "he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of this world, how he may please his wife, and is divided," and therefore unable to give himself wholly to the service of God, declared married priests incapable of exercising ecclesiastical functions, and made every effort to carry out in practice the idea so forcibly expressed by St. Paul and so ardently advocated by himself.[1]

---

[1] *Concil. Lateran IV.*, Capitul. X.: Unde praecipimus tam in cathedralibus, quam in aliis conventualibus ecclesiis viros idoneos ordinari, quos Episcopi possint coadjutores et coöperatores habere, non solum in praedicationis officio, verum etiam in audiendis confessionibus et poenitentiis injungendis ac caeteris, quae ad salutem pertinent animarum. Decretal. Greg. IX., Lib. I., Tit. XXXI. De officio Jud. Ordin., c. 15. (Tr.) *Mansi.*, T. XXII., p. 998 sq.; *Harduin.*, T. VII., p. 27 sq.; *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. V., p. 790.

[2] *Thomassini*, T. I., Lib. I., c. 27, de Episcopis titularibus. The popes did not wish to give up the rights and reminiscences of those former bishoprics, and continued to consecrate bishops for those lost churches, "si minus in Sedem, certe in *spem Sedis*, in titulum et nomen ejus." They were then Episcopi in partibus infidelium. Cf. *Dürr*, de Suffraganeis, Mogunt. 1782, 4to. In France, bishops-titular have been known only in very recent times.

[3] See above, p. 350.

There can be but little doubt that the unchastity of the clergy was the source of many other shameful vices. Numbers of ecclesiastics, notwithstanding that they were constantly reminded of their obligation to observe the rule of celibacy and to preserve a dignity becoming their state,[2] continued in a large measure the slaves of their passions, were worldly minded, lovers of pleasure, avaricious, and simoniacal, and got no more than they deserved in the savage criticisms and caustic satires of which they were the objects. But, while granting all this to *Mr. Gieseler*,[3] who is careful to remind us of it, we have, on the other hand, a right to demand that an exposition of the morals of the clergy of those times, when given at all, should be thorough and honest, and not unfair and done by halves. That there were many clergy distinguished by eminent virtues, in an age whose greatest institutions, worthy of the undying gratitude of mankind, may be directly traced to their exertions and influence, can admit of no doubt; and yet our author has not a *single* word of commendation of either the lives or the labors of these men. *Hase*, who is also a Protestant, is far more fair. "The declamations," says he, "which are sometimes found in the writings of that day, respecting clerical depravity, as a rule, had their origin in monastic prejudices or secular antipathies. The clergy must have shared in the virtues of that period; for, were it otherwise, their influence among the people would appear incomprehensible. The consciousness of control over the age in which they lived, and the true conception which they possessed of what a clergyman should be, contributed to elevate even the more degraded among the priesthood, and to make them sharers in the common spirit of their order."[1]

---

[1] Capitul. 31, Decretal. Greg. IX., Lib. I., Tit. XVII., c. 15: "Filiis canonicorum praebendas in eisdem ecclesiis conferri non sinatis, quarum sunt canonici patres eorum, quum indecorum sit, ut in altaris officio filius, impudico patri ministret, in quo unigenitus Dei filius aeterno patri pro salute humani generis victimatur." (Tr.)

[2] I. Cor. vii.; *Decretal.* Greg. IX., Lib. III., Tit. III., passim. (Tr.)

[3] Conf. his Church History, Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 252–261.

§ 232. *Church Property* (*cf. p.* 533).

Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., p. 135 sq. (Possessions of the Church.)

The clergy enjoyed exceptional advantages to accumulate wealth during that period of time included between the beginning and end of the Crusades. Many of the crusaders, before setting out from their homes, made over their property to the Church, in the belief that they should probably meet their death in the East; while others, hoping to secure more desirable estates in Palestine, sold those in Europe at quite a low price, and the Church was not unfrequently the purchaser.[2] The *tithes* also became now more productive, and this source of revenue was again increased by the offerings of the "*first-fruits*" (one-thirtieth or one-fiftieth). The tithes were, however, frequently contested, not by laymen alone, but by ecclesiastics also, who refused them to others of their own body; and so frequent and complicated were these contests that the reports of them occupy no small proportion of the chronicles stored away in the archives of churches and monasteries.

The Church always persistently refused to accept *a salary from the State* for her clergy, because, as Pope *Honorius III.* replied when it was offered by Hugh, king of Cyprus, it would be dangerous to her liberty.[3]

---

[1] Ch. Hist., Eng. trans., p. 223.

[2] *Eberhard of Salzburg* says, in a document dated 1159: "Tempore quo expeditio Jerosolymitana fervore quodam miro et inaudito a saeculis totum fere commovit Occidentem, coeperunt singuli tanquam ultra non redituri vendere possessiones suas, quas ecclesiae secundum facultates suas suis prospicientes utilitatibus emerunt." Monum. Boica., T. III., p. 540.

[3] "Beloved son," said the Pope, "those who receive salaries are subject to those who pay them. Should an employer desire to rid himself of one in his pay, he stops his salary, and the employé must leave off work. If you so secure the revenue of ecclesiastics that no one can deprive them of it, I shall

A great part of the wealth thus accumulated by the Church was spent in founding noble institutions, building hospitals and homes for the poor, providing for orphans and pilgrims, sustaining universities, promoting commercial and industrial interests, and forwarding the growth of civilization. It is all the more to be regretted that she should have been despoiled of her property by rapacious nobles when the proceeds of it were turned to so good account. They not only exercised the *right of spoil* (jus spolii),[1] but also laid heavy imposts upon the estates of the Church—a practice which was prohibited by many popes after Alexander III.

The division among the members of cathedral and collegiate chapters and certain others of the clergy, of property which had heretofore been held and administered in common for the benefit of all by the bishops of the several dioceses, had a most injurious effect. Those who had *the administration* of ecclesiastical property were sometimes so open and so bold in their methods of plundering[2] that it was necessary to appeal to the secular power to have them removed, and thus put a stop to their shameless extortions.

---

at once send you all the priests you desire." *Diomedes*, Cronica di Cipro, in *Raumer*, Vol. VI., p. 135.

[1] Vide supra, p. 355.

[2] Cf. *Raumer*, Vol. VI., p. 381-388. According to the account given by a contemporary, *Baldricus*, Gottfried, Archbishop of Treves, was treated with the utmost arrogance by Ludovicus, his Vice-Dominus: "Dom. *Godofredum* Archiepisc. suis artibus tantum sibi subegerat, quod dicebat, se in beneficio tenere palatium atque omnes reditus episcopales in illud deferendos, et quod ipse pascere deberet episcopum cum suis capellanis, etc.; ad episcopum autem dicebat pertinere missas et ordinationes Clericorum et consecrationes ecclesiarum celebrare; sui vero juris dicebat esse terram regere, omniaque in episcopatu disponere et militiam tenere, etc." *Hontheim*, Hist. Trevir., T. I., p. 468.

CHAPTER III.

FANATICAL AND REFRACTORY SECTS.

Accounts of contemporaries: *Ebrardi Flandrensis*, e Betunia oriundi, Lib. antihaeresis ed. 1. *Jacob. Gretseri* (Max. Bibl. PP., T. XXIV.) *Ermengardi* Opusc. contra eos, qui dicunt et credunt, mundum istum et visibilia omnia non esse a Deo facta, sed a diabolo (ibid). *Alani ab insulis* (monk of Clairvaux, † 1202), Libb. IV., ctr. haereticos (Waldenses, Judaeos et Paganos) sui temp., Lib. I. et II., ed. *Masson.*, Par. 1612; Libb. III. et IV., ed. C. *Vischius.* (Bibl. scriptt. Cisterciens. Colon. 1656, p. 411.) *Bonacursus* (first teacher of the Cathari, then a member of the Catholic Church), Vita haereticor. s. manifestatio haeresis Catharor. (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 208.) *Rainerii Sachon.* (first a Waldensis, then a Catholic and Dominican, † 1259), Summa de Catharis et Leonistis s. Pauperib. de Lugduno. (Martene et Durand, Max. Collect., T. V.) *Ejusdem* vel alius *Rainerii* lib. adv. Waldens. (Max. Bibl. PP., T. XXV.) — **Du Plessis d'Argentré*, Collectio judicior. de novis error. ab initio XII., saec. usque ad a. 1632; Par. 1728, 3 T. f. *Fuesslin*, New and impartial History of the Heresies of the Middle Ages, Frankfort, 1770, 3 pts. *Hahn*, Hist. of the Heresies of the Middle Ages, especially from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, Stuttg. 1847 sq., 3 vols. *Reuter*, Pope Alexander III., Vol. III., p. 647 sq. On the heretics of Italy during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see *Cesare Cantù*, Gli eretici d' Italia, Torino, 1865 sq., 2 vols.

§ 233. *General View.*

When the Church had reached the height of her temporal power and political influence, and had in consequence come into possession of vast land-estates, her position very naturally provoked comment, and she was not unfrequently judged unfairly by reason of the absence of true historical criticism. Those under the influence of partisan feeling, as well as those who believed that their interests had been injured or slighted, brought trivial and exaggerated charges against her. She was reproached with being excessively wealthy and in close alliance with the world, both of which, it must be admitted, are always dangerous to, if not entirely subversive of her most vital interests. Individuals[1] scattered here and there, and particular *sects*, such as had in early times assailed the constitution of the Church, but whose numbers, now *increased* with extraordinary rapidity, raised their voices against the tendency of the age, gave in their own lives examples of voluntary poverty and austere morality, and proclaimed in earnest and impassioned language the necessity of going back to the simplicity of *apostolic* days, when the Church was *poor* indeed, but free and standing apart from the State. These declamations were all the more effective, inasmuch as they were directed against a clergy, many of whose members were worldly and little solicitous for the spiritual weal of their flocks. They appealed, in justification of their course, to epochs in the history of the Church, when analogous evils were dealt with in a similar way, and to the prophetic warnings of great and saintly men, such as *St. Bernard*, *St. Hildegard*, *St. Malachy* (Archbishop of Armagh), and *Joachim* of Calabria.[1] The characteristics of these sects were opposition to the constitution of the Church, contempt of her doctrine, disdain of all learning and science, a fierce and gloomy fanaticism, a tendency to pursue one idea without regard to ultimate consequences, a revival of certain forms of the old *Gnostic* and *Manichaean* errors, and a *coarse and degrading Pantheism.* Hence they are called, generally, *Cathari* or *Neo-Manichaeans.*

---

[1] See Vol. I., p. 755 sq.

---

[1] *Bernardus*, de Considerat. ad Eugen. III.; *Hildewardis* abbatissa, sanctissima Virgo et prophetissa, vita ejus in *Bolland.* Acta SS., ad 17 m. Septemb. Epp. et opusc. (Max. Bibl., T. XXIII., p. 535 sq.) On St. Malachy, cf. St. Bernard, lib. de vita et reb. gestis St. Malach. u. sermo II. in transitu St. Malach. (Opp. Venet., T. II., p. 663; T. III., p. 326 sq.) The vaticinia Malachiae Hiberni de Papis romanis, also in *Gfroerer.* prophetae vett. pseudepigraphi. The bibliograhy on this prophecy, see in *Fabricii* Biblioth. med. et infim. Latin., T. V., sub verbo, Malachias. They consist of enigmatical oracles taken from the Bible, each of which is supposed to contain some reference to the popes from Celestine II. (A. D. 1143) onward to the end of the world. For example, Celestine II. is referred to as "ex Castro Tiberis," Lucius II. as "inimicus expulsus," Eugene III. as "ex magnitudine montis" (supposed to be an allusion to the mountains near Pisa, his native city), and the present pope, Pius IX., as "crux de cruce," after whom it is said there will be eleven more popes, whose characteristics will be Lumen in coelo, Ignis ardens, Religio depopulata, Fides intrepida, Pastor angelicus, Pastor et nauta, Flos florum, De medietate lunae, De labore solis, Gloria olivae; and of the last, *Petrus II.*, it is said: "Pascet oves in multis tribulationibus, quibus transactis civitas septicollis diruetur et judex tremendus judicabit populum suum." St. Bernard, while referring to Malachy's gift of prophecy, in his life of that holy archbishop, makes no mention of these predictions. An attempt was therefore made to fasten their authorship on Malachy, the Irish Franciscan, but as he lived about the opening of the fourteenth century (A. D. 1316), he could have had no connection with them, except as a *continuator*. *Menestrier*, S. J., Traité sur les prophéties attribuées à St. Malachie, 1686, endeavors to show that this so-called prophecy had its origin in the conclave of 1590, where the party of Cardinal Simoncelli

§ 234. *Tanchelm, Eon, Peter of Bruis, Henry of Lausanne, and the Passagians.*

Sects that had sprung up silently and in private were encouraged, by the hostile attitude of emperors and nobles toward the Church, to come forth from their privacy and openly proclaim their errors. *Their origin and development bear a striking analogy to those of the Apostolic age, which, commencing while our Lord was still on earth, gradually issued in the well-known Judaizing, Gnostic, Manichaean, and Montanistic sects.* *Tanchelm* (A. D. 1115–1124), an illiterate and fanatical layman, like the pseudo-Messiahs of Samaria, became the founder of a sect in Brabant. He proclaimed himself the Son of God, preached against ecclesiastical organizations, had churches erected in his own honor, set up the state of a king, collected around himself a body-guard of three thousand, gave himself the title of Divinity, celebrated his pretended espousal to the Blessed Virgin with great pomp and circumstance, repudiated the sacraments of the Church and her hierarchy,

---

referred to their candidate, Nicholas Sfondrata, afterward Gregory XIV., as designated by the words "de antiquitate urbis," because he was of Milan, which, according to popular tradition, existed four hundred years before Rome. Then, he says, in order that these words might carry with them the force of authority, the prophecy was supplemented backward and carried forward. Apart from a few designations which are quite apposite and significant, as *Peregrinus Apostolicus* for Pius VI., *Aquila rapax* for Pius VII. (an allusion to the French eagle, Napoleon I.), and *Canis et Coluber* for Leo XII., the prophecy is meaningless and enigmatical, and it requires considerable ingenuity to find events in the lives of the several popes to which the corresponding predictions can be made to apply with any sort of appositeness. Cf. *Weingarten,* The Prophecy of St. Malachy (Theolog. Studies and Criticisms of 1857, nro. 3). *Ginzel,* St. Malachy and the prophecy attributed to him. (*Austr. Quart. of Theol.*, year 1868, nro. 1.)

forbade the payment of the tithes, was guilty of all sorts of blasphemy in its grossest form, and was finally slain at Antwerp by a priest, about the year 1124.[1]

Eon d'Etoile (*Eudo de Stella*), a wealthy nobleman, also proclaimed himself the Son of God, and wished to found a new kingdom. He seems to have been either very ignorant or very crazy. On account of the similarity between his name, Eon, and Eum in the formula of exorcism—"*Per Eum qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*"—he fancied that he was the true Messiah, and called upon others to regard him as such. He went up and down, through Brittany and Gascony, accompanied by a large number of followers, and living in sumptuous style. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment by the council of Rheims (A. D. 1148), where he died, still hopeful of the ultimate success of his cause. His followers announced that he would come again to judge the quick and the dead.

Peter de Bruis, who became notorious in Southern France, was a deposed priest (A. D. 1104–1125), of whom little is known until after he took up the rôle of a reformer. He rejected infant baptism; denied the Real Presence in the Eucharist; declaimed against the Mass as a continuation of the sacrifice on Calvary; celebrated the communion service simply as a memorial rite; held that no special sanctity resided in consecrated buildings, and that God might be honored as well in stables as before altars; forbade the erection of new churches, and directed that those already built should be pulled down; was fanatically opposed to the worship of the Cross, which, he said, should be the horror of all Christians, inasmuch as it was the instrument of Christ's torture and death; condemned the practice of praying for the dead, and of giving alms and doing other good works in their behalf; and, finally, prohibited all chanting and the use of any kind of sacred music. It might be inferred that one holding tenets such as these would be severely ascetical in his moral teaching and in his own conduct, but this was not the case with Peter. He encouraged marriage, even in priests, as a strictly religious duty, and wished to abolish the fasts of the Church. This popular reformer, while engaged one day at St. Giles, near Arles, in committing to the flames a number of images and pictures, was seized by a mob who grew furious at his disrespectful treatment of holy things, and cast into the fires he had lighted, thus being himself in a measure the instrument of his own death. His followers are called *Petrobrusians*.[1]

---

[1] Vie de S. Norbert II. 126. — *D'Argentie*, Collect. Judic. i. 11. (Tr.)

Peter was followed in the same region of country by *Henry the Deacon*, also called *Henry of Lausanne* (A. D. 1116–1148), who, formerly a monk of the abbey of Clugny, had withdrawn from his order previously to becoming a reformer. Like Peter, he was a violent opponent of all sorts of sacred music, an enthusiastic advocate of marriage, and a determined enemy of the clergy. In the early part of his career he specially devoted himself to the mission of reclaiming courtesans, and so successful was he that many of these unfortunate women at his bidding cast their costly robes, their jewels, and other adornments into the flames, and entered upon exemplary lives. So general did his influence become, that, when he proceeded to arraign the indolence and immorality of the clergy, people deserted the churches, flocked to hear him, and, roused by the fierce energy of his words, threatened violence to those against whom his denunciations were directed. His rude eloquence, his ascetic life, and his single-minded earnestness favorably impressed *Hildebert*, Bishop of *Le Mans*, who, on Henry's arrival from Switzerland, received him kindly and gave him permission to preach throughout his diocese. But, discovering that he was an insolent and ignorant imposter, the prudent bishop contrived a public meeting between himself and Henry, and, after exposing his utter lack of education to the people, expelled him from the diocese. Henry then retired to the south of France, where, as Peter the Venerable says, he became the "inheritor of the wickedness" of Peter of Bruis, whose doctrine he continued to preach until the death of that fanatic. He escaped the fate of Peter by flight into Gascony (A. D. 1125), but having entered the diocese of Arles a few years later, he was arrested and taken before Pope Innocent II., then in exile at Pisa, who did no more than commit him to the keeping of St. Bernard. Escaping from his confinement some years later, he returned to Languedoc, where, protected by the Count of Toulouse, he shortly regained his former influence over the people.

---

[1] *Petri Venerabilis*, Abb. Cluniac. Epist. ad Arelatensem Ebredunensem Archiepisc. Diensem Vapinunsem Episc. adv. Petrobrusianos Hereticos in Max. Bibl. Patr. Lugdunens. XXII. 1033, et sq. (Tr.)

Eugene III. requested St. Bernard's assistance in putting down the heresiarch and restoring religion among the people. The saint was victorious in this, as in every other undertaking of his life, because his strength was of God and not of man; and the account he has left us of the condition of the Church at that time in Southern France shows the vast influence of Henry. "I have found," says he, "churches empty of people, people without priests, priests not respected, Christians without Christ, God's holy places profaned, the sacraments no longer held in honor, and the holy days without solemnities."

Henry was afterward arrested by the Archbishop of Toulouse, sent to Rheims, A. D. 1148, where Eugene III. was then presiding over a council, and cast into prison, where he shortly died.[1]

The *Passagians* (Circumcisi) were a sect of Judaizing Catharists, of probably Eastern origin, and flourished chiefly in Lombardy at the close of the twelfth and the opening of the thirteenth century. Leading a wandering and vagabond life, they very likely got their name from resemblance, in their habits, to birds of passage (*passagieri*), or from some connection with the Crusades, to which the word *passagium* was not unfrequently applied. They maintained that the law of Moses[2] was binding, at all times and upon all persons, in everything except its sacrificial injunctions, and that Christ was not God, but only the highest of created beings, thus renewing the errors of the Ebionites and Arians respecting our Lord.

---

[1] *Acta Episcoporum Cenomanensium*, in *Mabillon's* Analect. Vet., cap. 35, 36; De Hildeberto Episc. *St. Bernardi* Epist. 241; *Peter Venerabilis*, Epist. adv. Petrobrusianos. (Tr.)

[2] Pope Nicholas III. complained, in the year 1278: "Verum etiam quam plurimi christiani veritatem catholicae fidei abnegantes se damnabiliter ad judaicum ritum transtulerunt. *Bonacursus*, Vita Haeret. in *D'Achéry's* Spicileg. I. 211; *Gerhard. Bergom.* in *Murator.* Antiqq. Ital. Med. Aevi, V. 152. (Tr.)

The other sects resemble, in their general features, those just described, and were all especially conspicuous by their determined hostility, in some form or other, to the Catholic Church.

§ 235. *The Waldenses.*

Cf. Bibliogr. heading, § 233, esp. *Rainerius*, contr. Waldens, in Bibl. Max. Lugd. XXV. *Lucae Tudens*, Succedan. Prolegom., ibid. *Ebrardus*, ibid. *Works: Jean Leger* (pasteur des églises des Vallées), Hist. générale des èglises évangéliques de Piémont, etc., Leyde, 1669, 2 vols. f. German by Schweinitz; Bres. 1750, 2 vols. 4to. *Jac. Brez* (Waldensian preacher), Hist. des Vaudois, Laus. et Utrecht, 1796, 2 T. 8vo.; German, Lps. 1798. *Blair*, History of the Waldenses, Edinb. 1833, 2 vols. *Charvaz*, Origine dei Valdesi, e carattere delle primitive loro dottrine, Tur. 1834; French, Recherches historiques sur la véritable origine des Vaudois, Par. 1836. *Hahn*, l. c., Vol. II. *Bender*, Hist. of the Waldenses, Ulm, 1850. *Dieckhoff*, the Waldenses during the Middle Ages, Götting. 1851. *Herzog*, the Romanian Waldenses, Halle, 1853; reply by *Dieckhoff*, the Waldenses during the M. A., Götting. 1858; the researches of the latter continued by *Friedrich*, the Adulteration of the Doctrine of the Waldenses through the French Reformed Church (Austr. Quart. of Theol, Vienna, 1866, n 1, p. 41–82). Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 1785. — Tr. adds: *Maitland's* Tracts, and Documents connected with the Hist. of the Waldenses; *Todd's* Books of the Vaudois; Articles on the Noble Lesson, by *Hon. Alg. Herbert*, in British Mag. XVIII., XIX.; *Melia*, Origin, Persecutions, and Doctrines of the Waldenses, 1870; *Blunt*, Dictionary of Sects, and *Bossuet*, Hist. of the Variations.

Since the sixteenth century, unsuccessful attempts have been made, by those who regard the Waldenses as the legitimate forerunners of Protestantism, to trace their origin back to the Apostolic age, or at least to the time of the iconoclast, Claudius of Turin, and for this purpose their history has been falsified and their doctrines misrepresented. These efforts to pervert the truth of history have been ably refuted by *Herzog*, *Friedrich*, and *Melia*.

According to *Catholic* authorities, whose honesty can not be fairly called in question, they derive their origin from *Peter Waldo* (Peter of Vaux, or Valdum—English, "*Wood*"), a wealthy merchant of Lyons, who, disconsolate at the sudden death of one of his friends, sought relief from his sorrow in the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and selected from them such passages as made a powerful impression upon him, to which he added extracts from the Fathers having special reference to these texts. Desirous of following literally the teaching contained in the biblical and patristic extracts he had made, he resolved to give himself wholly to religion, and, distributing his large property among the poor, he embraced a life of poverty, living on alms and going about instructing others (c. A. D. 1160). He next hired a poor scholar to translate into the Romanic vernacular language the Gospels and the extracts he had already made from the Bible and the writings of the Fathers, and in 1170 commenced his mission as *apostolic* teacher by preaching publicly in the pulpit. As his followers increased in number, he sent out chosen disciples, two and two, to preach in the country about Lyons, enjoining upon them apostolic poverty and the duty of earning their bread by the sweat of their brows. The members of the sect were known as the "*Poor Men of Lyons*" (Pauperes de Lugduno), or *Leonists*, but called themselves the "*Humble Ones*" (Humiliati). They, being *laymen*, were forbidden to preach by the Archbishop of Lyons, to whom they replied, "We must obey God rather than man," and went on. When the archbishop again peremptorily commanded them to leave off the practice of preaching, they appealed (A. D. 1179) to Pope *Alexander III.*, to whom they also sent some of the translated books of the Bible, with their own annotations. The Pope commended their poverty, but reproved them for interfering with the duties of the clergy, and referred them to their bishop for any further information they might desire. Things continued in this way until the death of Alexander and the election of his successor, *Lucius III.*, to whom they again sent for permission to preach. Lucius refused their petition, and, at the synod of Verona (A. D. 1184), excommunicated the Waldenses and the other heretics of Southern France. They paid no attention to the excommunication, saying that it was void when pronounced against persons engaged in a good work, and that there was a necessity of having a body of laymen side by side with a degenerate and worldly clergy, to preach the pure *apostolic* doctrine. Claiming a higher antiquity than other sects, being more numerous, and living apparently more holy lives, they gained steadily in influence and importance. Having their stronghold in Southern France and Piedmont, they spread to Milan on the one side, and to Aragon on the other, and existed in large numbers at Metz.

In 1194, Alphonso II. issued an edict against them, in which he designated them as "enemies of the Cross, profaners of the religion of Christ, and dangerous to both King and State," and threatened them with the confiscation of their property and the penalties of high treason. Notwithstanding these condemnations, they sent, in 1212, another address to Pope *Innocent III.*, praying him to recognize their conventicles as lawful, but were again unsuccessful. Innocent, who at one time entertained a hope of being able to bring their practice of evangelical poverty within the rules of monasticism, and in this way to control the movement, gave the Waldenses of Metz permission to meet and read the Holy Scripture.

These sectaries had now become so numerous that they were to be found all over Southern France, Piedmont, Lombardy, and had even spread to Eastern Europe. They assailed *the external constitution* and *visible organization of the Church;* threw off the authority of pope and bishops; asserted the right of laymen and even women to preach; refused to pay tithes themselves, and condemned the practice in others; recognized at first the power of the priest alone to absolve penitents and consecrate the Eucharist, but when refused absolution and Holy Communion, affirmed that laymen might *validly do both* in *case of necessity;* abolished a great part of the rite of baptism; some of them denied the existence of *purgatory*, asserting that souls, when parted from the body, go either to heaven or hell, while others believed in an intermediate state; held that, in the matter of the *veneration of saints*, the apostles alone should be held in honor, but *not invoked;* and, finally, opposed the use of crosses, images, and all ornaments in churches, and admitted no custom or tradition not contained in Scripture.

The members were divided into the *Perfect* and the *Imperfect*. The former possessed no property and observed a strict fast. The latter lived in society pretty much as other men, only avoiding all sensual indulgence and luxurious excess. In moral character they were superior to all other heretical sects, such as the Albigenses and Paulicians.

They were at first governed by bishops of their own appointment, whom they styled "*majorales*," and by *presbyters* and *deacons;* all which orders, they said, had been instituted by Christ. Their seniors, priests, and deacons held divine services, were celibate, and had led pure, holy, self-sacrificing lives previously to the sixteenth century, supporting themselves by the labor of their hands. To preach the Gospel in the vernacular they considered the primary and central object of religious worship, and held that the Holy Scripture is the one and *only* source of faith.

Having spread among the Cathari, they were the objects of a most cruel persecution; but, in spite of all opposition, they have maintained themselves down to the present day, and still exist, to the number of twenty-two thousand, in the mountains of Dauphiné and the Piedmontese Alps.[1]

In the sixteenth century they came into contact with the Reformers, from whom they *received many new teachings and practices*, and have quite recently been regarded with much favor by the Anglicans, who, in 1848, materially aided them in building a magnificent church in the city of Turin, and assisted at its consecration in 1853, intending to make it, if possible, a stronghold of Protestantism in Italy.

§ 236. *The Cathari and the Albigenses.*

LITERATURE: Accounts of contemporary, all orthodox, writers concerning the Cathari, by *Bonacursus*, see above, bibliography heading, § 233; on the Albigenses, *Petri monachi Sarnensis* (de Vaux Cernay), Historia Albigens., and *Guil. de Podio Laurentii* (Capelan. Raymundi VII.), sup. hist. negotii Francor. adv. Albig. (*du Chesne.*, T. V.; better in *Bouquet-Brial.*, T. XIX.) *Rainerii*, hist. in Bouquet, T. XVIII. *Gulielmus de Tudela*, Guerre des Albigeois, in Bouquet, T. XVIII.; Codex Tolosanae inquis., from 1307 to 1323, by Limborch, Amsterd. *J. Chassanion*, Hist. des Albigeois., Par. 1595.; Histoire générale de Languedoc. par un religieux Bénédictin de la Congr. de St. Maur. (Claude le Vic et Jos. Vaissette), T. III., Par. 1737. Hist. Polit. Papers, by *Phillips* and *Goerres*, Vol. II., p. 470–783. [TRANS. ADD.: The most valuable learning applied to the many difficulties with which the history of the Albigenses abounds is to be found in the Histoire de la Poésie Provençale, by *M. Fauriel*, Paris, and in *Maitland's* Facts and Documents connected with the History of the Albigenses and Waldenses.]

---

[1] Besides the historical work of *Charvaz*, bishop of Pignerol (later of Geneva), see also his recent apologetical work, entitled "Le guide du catéchumène Vaudois," Paris, 1839. *Zezschwiz*, The Catechisms of the Waldenses and Moravian Brethren, Erlangen, 1853.

For want of words definitely expressing the characteristics of the various sectaries professing Gnostic, Manichaean, and other cognate errors, they were generally called Cathari (*καϑαροι*), or "Puritans." They all made pretensions to superior sanctity, and were distinguished by their intense opposition to the clergy. The more advanced and rigid among them held that *the spirit of darkness, and not the God of light, was the creator of all visible things*, and that his son, Lucifer, having seduced a host of heavenly spirits by his wiles, imprisoned them in bodies of clay here on earth. These imprisoned spirits, they said, formed a distinct class of mankind, for whose deliverance Christ descended from Heaven in *apparently* human (Docetism), but really angelic form. But, while professing this doctrine, they adopted external rites and formulas of prayer, and practiced genuflection and other ceremonial observances, which are the natural outgrowth and expression of a belief in the Catholic doctrine of the divinity and humanity of Christ.[1]

Such theories led straight to an abandonment of the fundamental teachings of Christianity. Hence they rejected the Holy Eucharist and the other sacraments, denied the resurrection of the body and the efficacy of infant baptism, and declared matrimony to be an alliance whose author was the evil spirit.

Their dualistic principle also necessitated the division of all men into *two distinct classes*—viz., those who were sure to attain to salvation, and those who, by reason of their origin from the evil one, could never become virtuous or gain happiness. There could therefore be no such thing as moral guilt or imputation, and hence they said that an infant belonging to the latter class, if it should die the day after it was born, would be punished as severely as the traitor Judas or a highway robber.

---

[1] *C. Schmidt*, Hist. of the Cathari of Southern France during the second half of the thirteenth century, Strasburg, 1847; and in the Journal of Historical Theology, 1847, nro. 4. *Kunitz*, a Catholic *Ritual* (of the end of the thirteenth century), Jena, 1852.

Their method of purification was unique .and ingenious. The ceremony was called the *Consolation* (consolamentum), and consisted in the laying on of hands. Penitence was not required in the purified, who were at once received among the "perfect," and promised to lead continent and sinless lives in the future.

But, as it was difficult to count upon such unswerving constancy and perseverance in virtue, and as relapse into sin, inasmuch as they held divine *grace* to be *inamissible,* would prove the utter inefficiency of their system, and, if frequent, wholly destroy faith in the effectiveness of the *Consolamentum,* this came gradually to be administered only to those dangerously ill, and of whose speedy departure there could be no reasonable doubt. Should there, however, be prospects of their recovery, they were required to hasten their death by abstinence from food, or, more violently, by profuse bleeding. This process was called the "*Endura.*"[1]

While making a boast of being the only true followers of Christ and His apostles, they manifested the most determined opposition to the Catholic clergy, declaring that whosoever received the sacraments of the latter became thereby participators in their sins.

They were most numerous and influential in *Upper Italy* and *Southern France,* whence they spread along the banks of the Rhine, particularly to the territory about Treves (A. D.

---

[1] In the acts appended to the Protestant *Limborch's* Historia Inquisitionis, Amst. 1619, are given many instances of persons who, after having received the *Consolamentum* from the Perfect, were instructed to hasten their departure by violent means. Thus, in the Lib. Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tolosanae, p. 138, it is related of one Hugo Rubei: "Dictus Hugo in quadam infirmitate, de qua convaluit, fuit haereticatus per Petrum haereticum, et receptus est ad sectam et ordinem dicti haeretici, quam aliquibus diebus in dicta, infirmitate tenuit et servavit, stando in *endura,* sed postmodum ad instantiam matris suae comedit et convaluit. Item isto anno Petrus Sancti haereticus invitavit ipsum, quod vellet se ponere in *endura* et facere *bonem finem,* sed ipse non consensit tunc, sed quando esset in ultimo vitae suae.

1121), and into England (A. D. 1159),[1] and were variously known as Cathari, Patarini, Mediolanenses, Publiciani, and in France as Bons Hommes. Efforts to convert them were made, but in vain; decrees of councils were enacted against them, but to little or no purpose. These measures, and others equally charitable and well intended, having failed, Pope Alexander III. resorted to others more severe.[2]

But, of the sectaries who shared the errors of Gnosticism and Manichaeism and opposed the Catholic Church and her hierarchy, the *Albigenses* were the most thorough and radical. Their errors were indeed partly Gnostic and partly Manichaean, but the latter was the more prominent and fully developed. They received their name from a district of Languedoc, inhabited by the Albigeois and surrounding the town of Albi. They are called Cathari and Patarini in the acts of the council of Tours (A. D. 1163), and in those of the third Lateran, Publiciani (i. e., Pauliciani).

Like the Cathari, they also held that the evil spirit created all visible things. Starting from this principle, they could not of course escape the most monstrous consequences when they came to apply its deductions to the conditions of practical life. They were forced either to avoid all contact with matter, and to aspire to an extravagant and impossible degree of spirituality, or to allow to both body and spirit, which they said were absolutely distinct and independent of each other, the fullest possible range in their respective domains, thus sanctioning intellectual anarchy on the one hand, and unrestrained sensual indulgence on the other. Conformably to their view of the evil origin of matter, they abstained from all animal food except fish, and the more rigorous of them abjured marriage, styling it a species of fornication, but others advocated it, provided the bride were a virgin and husband and wife would separate from each other after the birth of their first child. Others, again, gave full sweep to their carnal passions, and indulged in the most revolting excesses, saying in excuse of their practices that the origin of man is not from God—holy; but from the evil one—sinful.

---

[1] Conf. Historia Treverens. *d'Achéry*, Spicilegium, T. II., and in *d'Argentré*, l. c., p. 24. *Evervin*, Provost of Steinfelden, applied to St. Bernard for help. Conf. *Evervini*, Praepos. Steinfeldens. ep. ad Bernardum. *Mabillonii* analecta T. III., p. 452, ed. nov. 1473; in d'Argentré, l. c., p. 33.

[2] *Conc. Lateranens.* III., cap. 27 (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. II., p. 1683 sq.)

They further taught that the souls of men are fallen spirits, which were all created at one time, but now condemned to pass from body to body, until, in the course of time, they become purified by this process and return to their primitive state. The formal means by which these souls wipe away the filth and cleanse the stains by which they are soiled are good works. There is, they said, no distinction of guilt in sins; all are equally heinous and deserving of death, but their punishment does not reach out beyond this world.

But, while some held this doctrine, others denied the immortality of the soul, or the existence of anything that does not fall under the senses. Many of them held that a belief in the *foreknowledge of God* implies an absolute fatalism in everything and a denial of free will in both God and man, at least in so far as it relates to the knowledge of evil and the power of preventing it.

Alexander III. had had *a crusade* preached against the Albigenses, in 1164, but it was carried on languidly, and no rigor of any consequence was exercised against them until the pontificate of Innocent III. This pope declared their teachings ruinous to the Church and subversive of society, and themselves "*more wicked than Saracens.*" In 1198 he sent among them *Rainer* and *Guido*, two Cistercian monks, with orders to preach to them, to instruct them, to discuss disputed points with them, and thus lead them back to the true faith. But, having failed in this attempt, they were advised (A. D. 1206) by *Diego*, Bishop *of Osma* in Spain, and *Dominic*, the subprior of his cathedral, both of whom willingly shared their labors, to dismiss their suite, and, going among these heretics in the poverty of the apostles, to make another effort to convert them. This heavenly inspired advice was enthusiastically taken up by the newly arrived papal legates, *Peter of Castelnau* and *Raoul*, who traveled up and down the country barefoot and in the scanty garb of apostles, but with little better success than attended the efforts of those who had preceded them. *Peter of Castelnau* was assassinated, and there were *good reasons for suspecting Raymond VI.*, Count of Toulouse, of complicity in the deed. First of all, he was the recognized protector of the Albigenses; next, he had had a violent dispute with Peter; and, finally, the crime was committed by two of his officers, whom he kept at his court and in his service after their guilt had become known.

Innocent, after hearing of this outrage, commissioned *Arnold*, Abbot of *Citeaux*, to preach a fresh crusade against them, which *Simon*, Count of *Monfort*, an intrepid and faithful Christian warrior, directed and brought to a successful conclusion. The campaign, which extended from the year 1209 to 1213, was one almost uninterrupted series of attacks and assaults on cities and strongholds, nor did the crusaders give over their work until the standard of the Cross rose in triumph from one end of Languedoc to the other.

Raymond, reduced to extremities, promised obedience to the Church, surrendered seven of his strongholds as pledges of his fidelity, did public penance, and expressed his willingness to take part in the crusade against those by whom he had been heretofore regarded as a leader and a protector.

The crusaders then directed their efforts against *Roger*, the powerful Viscount of *Béziers* and Carcasonne, and the Viscount of *Foix*. Their advance was irresistible. Béziers and Carcasonne were taken by storm (A. D. 1209), and numbers of the inhabitants, without distinction of faith, age, or sex, put to the sword.[1]

The vassals of Count Raymond were next attacked. The count himself, notwithstanding his undisguised anger at the conduct of the legates, who demanded from him an immediate cession of the conquered territory, made application to Pope Innocent for its restitution, and the latter, being far more intent on the suppression of the heretics than on the disposition of their estates or the gratification of those who championed the Catholic cause, readily yielded to his request.

---

[1] It is pretended that the abbot Arnold cried out, on this occasion: "*Slay all; God will know his own;*" but even the chroniclers who relate anything derogatory to the character of the prelates attending the Catholic army are silent on the subject. Only the credulous *Cæsarius of Heisterbach*, who has put a thousand fables in circulation, makes mention of this. Cf. *Bonn Periodical*, new series, Year IV., nro. 1, p. 161–164. † *Kaufmann*, Caesar of Heisterbach, being a contribution toward the history of civilization during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, 2 ed., Cologne, 1862.

During the siege of Lavour, in 1211, Raymond was discovered again rendering aid to the Albigenses, and a new crusade was in consequence undertaken against him. At the battle of Muret, in 1213, both he and his powerful ally and brother-in-law, *Peter II.*, King of Aragon, sustained an overwhelming defeat, and with this disaster ended the sanguinary and cruel crusade.

Montfort, who was styled "the gallant champion of the Cross and the invincible defender of the Catholic faith," was declared the lawful lord of the territory thus acquired, by the council of Montpellier, and the fourth council of Lateran (A. D. 1215) confirmed the title.

When the sanguinary and unheard-of cruelties committed in this crusade came to the knowledge of Innocent, he was borne down with grief. It was a source of sorrow to him that such deeds of violence should have been indulged in by those professing themselves the champions of the faith,[1] and it was no alleviation to his feelings to know that the partisans of error had been equally guilty of them.

§ 237. *Remarks on the Rigorous Measures Employed against these Sects.*

Unsatisfactory efforts have been made to show by historical testimony that the *origin* of all these sectaries may be *traced* back, step by step, to the Greek Paulicians, or, as some say, to the Manichaeans,[2] a knowledge of whose doctrines they gained from the writings of St. Augustine. But, be this as it may, it is certain that the immediate and direct source of these heresies is to be sought in the peculiar character of certain individuals, and in their exceptional relations to the Church. Heretics have at all times sought to justify their pretended zeal by alleging that the clergy failed to satisfy the religious wants of the people, and, it must be admitted, the charge had at times a very substantial foundation. But beyond this they had no adequate ground of complaint and no justification of their conduct. Ignorant, and superciliously proud, they affected a contempt of the mysteries of faith and manifested a fierce hostility to whatever was connected with the

---

[1] †*Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. II., p. 692, says: "Although great excesses may have been committed in the south of France against humanity and justice, in the course of these six years, and although the forces sent thither to reëstablish the authority and the faith of the Church carried on instead a war of indiscriminate rapine, still Innocent can not be held responsible for either. His orders were not carried out, and he was led by false reports to take measures which he would never have taken had he known the true state of affairs."

[2] Notwithstanding the denial by the author of this opinion, it is not without very plausible arguments in its favor, which we give, as related by *Blunt* (Dict. of Sects, Heresies, and Ecclesiastical Parties, art. *Albigenses*): "From Bulgaria, where Paulician Manichaeism (Paulicians) had been established since the

---

seventh century, the heretical ideas slowly permeated Europe. So general was this infiltration in the eleventh century, that there is hardly a western or northern country in which we do not find a disturbance traceable to this source. But the cold and phlegmatic temper of these regions was fatal to the oriental mysticism of Mani, upon which the new heresy was originally founded; while feudal and oligarchical institutions were ill-suited to the democratic spirit of the Paulicianism, from which it was immediately derived. In England, Northern France, and Germany, the Manichaean revolt was easily subdued; but in Southern France, Provence, and Italy, the case was different. In these last-named countries, Manichaeism in its earlier stage seems, in a great measure, from different causes, to have escaped notice. . . . Italy, too, was favorably situated for the dissemination of the heresy, in consequence of its proximity to Bosnia and the other provinces which bounded the home of Paulician Manichaeism, and the increasing intercourse brought about by the Crusades materially assisted this dissemination. Here the last of the three great waves of Manichaean opinion, which, in the third, the seventh, and the eleventh centuries respectively, threatened to desolate Christianity, beaten back from the rest of Europe, for the most part was poured. Here the heresy, elsewhere overpowered, was consolidated and developed, until, in the middle of the twelfth century, it burst out into that form to which the famous title of 'Albigensian' has been attached. There were many circumstances—traditions, situation, climate—predisposing the south of France to admit the influence of a heresy like Manichaeism. Septimania, which included Languedoc and Provence, and therefore the greater part of the Tolosan suzerainty, had, during four centuries of its early history, submitted without reluctance to the domination of Arian Goths or infidel Saracens. During the centuries immediately preceding the Manichaean revolt, the inhabitants had been accustomed to the demoralizing spectacle exhibited by the flourishing courts of the infidel princes of Spain. The Paulician Manichaeism, which had broken out first in Northern Europe, in the neighborhood of the emporia of the Eastern trade, at a short interval had appeared in Italy, that province of the Western Empire nearest to the Bulgarian frontier. The outbreak, though, as has been mentioned, for the

Church. Arnold of Brescia, in Upper Italy, and the Troubadours in Southern France, a class of men ever ready to sneer at bishops and priests, prepared the way for these fanatical sectaries.

When one reflects how universally and how severely the action of those who had *Priscillian* condemned to death was criticised,[1] it is difficult to account for the harsh measures employed against the Albigenses. But a moment's reflection on the *characteristics* and tendency of their teaching will go a good way in supplying the motives of their severe treatment. The consequences of their spiritual tenets reached out until they embraced all the relations of political, social, and commercial life, and were subversive of them all. They declared marriage fornication, thus sundering the most sacred of *social*

---

time successively crushed in the North, in the South had the effect, not only of exciting many new leaders of heretical opinion, but of awakening the dormant Manichaeism of central Italy. The connection between Italy and Provence was of long standing; and Languedoc, united, for a time at least, under the same lordship, was further connected by a community of participation in the Romanesque institutions and language. It was in the independent cities of Italy that the dying institutions of Paganism had lingered longest; it was in such towns that Manichaeism was earliest revived. And that this revival was a genuine rehabilitation of a dead heresy is evidenced by the fact that the old tenets which had been discarded by the Paulician heretics, from the seventh to the tenth centuries, are found flourishing in Provence and Italy in the twelfth. But, if Italy was foremost in the revival of Manichaeism, it is with the suzerainty of Toulouse that its connection was most famous and fatal. . . . Nor was the Church in these provinces capable of any considerable resistance, for the influence of their clergy was then at the lowest point that it has anywhere reached in the history of Christianity. A luxurious country, civilized beyond its age, almost wholly independent of the French king at Paris (in the preceding century it had absolutely ignored his existence), Languedoc enjoyed an almost licentious freedom, at a time when the rest of Europe was held in the strongest grasp of an almost universal military despotism. It was in this country, so predisposed by circumstance to receive the poison, that the streams of heretical opinion were appointed to meet. Southward, from Trèves, Cologne, Besançon—westward, from below the Pennine Alps—northward, from Tuscany and the States of the Church—the flow of heretical opinion converged upon Toulouse. The most fruitful and important district of the Tolosan count was the Albigeois, or that surrounding Albi, a town on a tributary of the Garonne, and the modern capital of the department of the Tarn; and it is from this territory that the name 'Albigensian,' now so famous, has, by a somewhat obscure process, been derived." (Tr.)

[1] See Vol. I., p. 757.

bonds and sloping the way to the most revolting immorality; they set fire to churches built by the generous devotion of the faithful and endeared to them by a hundred ties; they sought out and destroyed objects of Christian worship which every Catholic regarded with mingled feelings of love and reverence; and so universal and complete was their vandalism that *St. Bernard*, on visiting the country, said he found "the churches empty of people, the people without priests, . . . the sacraments dishonored, and Christians dying unconverted, impenitent, and without the last rites of the Church."[1] It would have required a heroic exercise of patience in Catholics of any age to remain indifferent or peaceful spectators of such outrages, and patient endurance was not a characteristic of those sturdy and uncompromising ages of faith. Again, these sectaries, instead of working side by side with the Church in removing the evils and correcting the abuses, the presence of which she recognized and deplored, seemed only intent on her overthrow and destruction. Hence the Catholic Church, being in those times universally regarded as the one and only source of salvation, and even slight deviations from her teaching as denials by implication of the entire deposit of faith, it is not surprising that the Head of Christendom, in view of the threatened danger to the Church, and out of solicitude for the salvation of souls, should, after trying every possible means which paternal kindness and Christian charity could suggest, have finally proceeded to extremities against the enemies of the Church and of social morality. Moreover, the *secular power*, then intimately united with ecclesiastical authority, believing that the very foundations of the State were threatened by these sectaries, actively coöperated with the Church in putting them down. This close alliance of Church and State will explain why, in the Middle Ages, *heresy was regarded by the latter as a political offense;* and further, why, in the Sicilian code of Frederic, which was certainly not conceived in a spirit friendly to the Church, the severest penalties should have been enacted against heretics. But we do not wish to be understood as saying or implying that the reasons brought forward in defense of the *political* code of those times punishing heresy with death, are at all sufficient to justify such severity according to our ways of thinking. We simply wish to make clear to the reader how, in the Middle Ages, when the two powers were expected by the people to work in harmony together, a policy was pursued toward heretics so different from that of earlier times, and how, as time went on, a *personal surveillance* was exercised over them, which finally led to the establishment of the *Inquisition*—an institution which has been the object of more misrepresentation and erroneous judgment than any other known to history. We shall have occasion to speak of this in detail further on. We will only say, in passing, that the Inquisition was first put in operation against the *Stedingers*, a politico-religious sect of Frieslanders occupying the territory now included in the present duchy of Oldenburg, who, under pretense of opposing the tyranny of the nobles and clergy, excited the people to rebellion, refused to pay the tithes or to render obedience to bishops, and went about massacring priests. They were denounced as Albigenses by *Conrad of Marburg*, a secular priest, whom Gregory IX. appointed inquisitor-general, with authority to proceed against them. But Conrad, having employed unnecessarily severe measures, excited the indignation of certain nobles, by whom he was murdered. Grave, and, it would seem, well-founded doubts have recently been started as to the justice of the high character heretofore given to this man, who was also the confessor of St. Elizabeth.[1] Like *Dorso*, a Dominican lay-brother, and *John*, a layman, both of whom boasted of their gift of discovering heretics, Conrad, sheltering himself behind the stringent laws against errorists, pursued them with the savage violence of a fanatic. Gregory IX., on learning, very much to his surprise, how this inquisitor had conducted himself, said: "The Germans have always been a fierce race, and hence they have now unrelenting judges."

---

[1] Cf. *Hurter*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 663, and *Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, 2 ed., Tübg. 1851, p. 241 sq.

---

[1] On Conrad of Marburg, cf. the Life of St. Elizabeth, by Count Montalembert (German transl. by Staedler, pp. 332, 561–567). *Henke*, Conrad of Marburg, ibidem, 1861. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc. V. 902–915. *Schumacher*, the Stedingians, Bremen, 1865.

§ 238. *Amalric of Bena—David of Dinanto—Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit—Apostolic Brethren.*

The sect founded by *Amalric of Bena*,[1] a theologian and dialectitian of Paris, presents characteristics quite different from those of the sects just described. Led astray by the writings of *Scotus Erigena* and the teachings of the Arabic Paripatetics, he spread among his numerous auditory the doctrines of *out-and-out Pantheism*, following close in the wake of the abbot *Joachim*.

While professor of logics and exegetics at the University of Paris, Amalric was not noticed to put forward any strange opinion, except that all Christians are *personally* members of Christ, *in that* they have borne with Him the sufferings of the Cross. Taken in itself, this doctrine was susceptible of many interpretations, and might possibly have been explained away, but when placed beside the other teachings of Amalric, and taken as part of his system, it was downright Pantheism, and, as such, was condemned by the University of Paris in 1204. Having been in consequence deprived of his professor's chair, he personally appealed to Pope Innocent III., by whom his teaching was also condemned and he himself ordered to return to Paris and recant his errors (A. D. 1207). He died of grief in 1209.

After the death of Amalric, it was discovered he had left quite a large following behind him, among whom the most conspicuous in the advocacy of his doctrines were *William*, a goldsmith of Paris, and *David of Dinanto*. From the teaching of these men, it soon came out that the underlying principle of Amalric's system was the Pantheistic proposition: "*All things are one, and, conversely, one is all; this all is God; ideas and God are identical;*"[2] thus denying the doctrine of the three Divine Persons in the Trinity, and substituting instead a sort of allegorical symbolism. "We are to understand," it was said, "by the term '*Father*,' that period of the world's history in which the life of the senses was paramount, as is exemplified throughout the Old Testament and in the forms of Jewish worship; by the term '*Son*,' the period during which spirit and matter were in equilibrium, when men turned their thoughts in upon themselves and strengthened the faculties of the soul, but were still unable to completely triumph over the senses and the influences of the world without; by the term '*Spirit*,' the age of man when the purely spiritual and intellectual shall achieve a glorious triumph over matter, and rule supreme. When this age shall have dawned, the sacraments of the New Testament, instituted by Christ—viz., Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist—will lose their efficacy, cease to be necessary or useful, and pass away. Every one shall then be immediately inspired by the Holy Spirit, without the aid of supplementary contrivances or '*outward practices*,' and in this way work out his salvation. This inspiration," Almaric added, "is the result of '*interior recollections*.' Prophets, apostles, and poets were all equally inspired, and differed only as to their several objects of inspiration. Sanctification is but the consciousness of the presence of God—the filling of the soul with the thought of 'all in one and one in all.' Sin is but the shackles that time and space have flung about man. In the last age, when matter shall fade into spirit and all external things pass away, the external *cultus*, from the nature of the case, shall also cease. Whoever," this impious madman went on to say, "whoever lives in the Holy Spirit can not stain his soul with the guilt of sin, even if he should be a fornicator; each of us is Christ, each of us the Holy Spirit."

---

[1] So called from his native town, in the diocese of Chartres. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Amalric of Bena (Essays on Ch. H., nro. 3). *Conc. Paris.* acta. (*Martène*, Thesaurus anecd., T. IV., p. 163 sq., in *Mansi*, T. XXII., p. 801 sq.) *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 633 sq. *Krönlein*, De genuina Amalrici a Bena ejusque sectatorum ac Davidis de Dinanto doctrina, Gissae, 1842. The *same*, in Theolog. Studies and Criticisms, 1847, nro. 2. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 288–293.

[2] *St. Thomas Aquinas* draws a distinction between the teaching of Amalric

David of Dinanto started from a principle widely different from that of Amalric. According to the teaching of the latter, God was the *formal principle* (principium formale) of all

---

and that of David. The former, he says, considered God the *principium formale* of all things; the latter taught that He was the *materia prima*. Summa, Pars I., Quaest. III., Art. VIII. (Tr.)

things, the *material source* (materia prima), according to that of the former. David was also more hostile than Amalric to the Christian religion, inasmuch as he sought arguments to support his system in the writings of Pagan philosophers. It was not long until the poison of *false philosophy* thus introduced through the medium of Amalric's system permeated all the *heretical systems* then in vogue, such as the Cathari, the Albigenses, and others.[1]

The teachings of this sect were condemned by the synod of Paris, in 1209, and the organization in consequence hopelessly broken.

It is more than probable the sectaries known as the *Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit*,[2] holding partly Montanistic and partly Pantheistic theories, were the legitimate issue of the Amalricians. The name was intended to be representative of their doctrine, which they professed to find in the following words of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans (viii. 2, 14): "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;" and in those of St. John's Gospel (iv. 23): "The true adorer shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth." Starting from these two texts, they claimed, first, exemption from all external laws and ordinances, and next, freedom from sin, and in consequence believed themselves to be children of God. Their system was a sort of *mystical pantheism*, somewhat analogous to that of the Paulicians. They held that everything is a direct emanation from God, and applied to themselves the words of Christ: "I and the Father are One." As many, they said, as have brought this doctrine home to themselves are no longer under the dominion of sense (John iv. 23), can not be defiled by contact with the outer world, and have therefore passed into a higher state of existence, and have no more need of the sacraments. Drawing a broad and clean distinction between matter and mind, amounting to a complete sundering of the two, they maintained that the soul could not be stained by sensual excesses, and accordingly some of them gave the fullest swing to their passions, and freely indulged in the grossest impurity.

---

[1] Cf. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 629 sq.

[2] See the detailed Bibliography in *Engelhardt's* Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 151.

They were singular in their dress, led a vagabond life, and, while professing a strict observance of the vow of poverty, lived on the labor of others. Wandering from village to village and from town to town, they sang out as they went along: "Bread for God's sake" ("Brot durch Gott"); and as their number steadily increased, they grew daily more importunate, and their professional character as beggars better known. They were called, in consequence of their pertinacious appeals, *Beggars* ("*Beghard*" and "*Beguts*"), and in France, "*Turlupins*," probably from their wolfish or predatory habits. Owing to the considerable number of women, who constantly accompanied them, they were called ironically by the Germans "*Sisterers*" (Schwestriones), and early accused of immoral practices. They were most numerous at Cologne, whence they spread along the banks of the Rhine and through France and the Netherlands. About the middle of the thirteenth century, they carried their doctrines into male and female convents, particularly in Suabia, calling upon monks and nuns to throw off the *rule* of their respective orders and commit themselves to the guidance and influence of the Free Spirit. Stringent measures were now taken to suppress them.[1]

The *Apostolical Brethren* were a kindred sect. They were founded by *Gerard Segarelli*, a fanatical young man of Parma, who had been dismissed from a Franciscan convent. Like many of the heresiarchs who went before him, he believed himself called upon to revive the apostolical era of the Church. He entered upon his self-appointed mission in 1261, and, accompanied by a number of followers, who, though not permitted to marry, were attended by women called "Sisters," went up and down the country, begging, singing, and announcing that the kingdom of God was at hand. The scope and aim of their teaching were for some time kept secret, but gradually came out, when it was discovered that they were communistic, subversive of society at large, hostile to the Church, but directed chiefly against the Papacy. Both Church and State undertook their suppression, and in 1300, their fanatical leader, Gerard, was burned to death at Parma.

---

[1] "Their professed object," says *Ullmann*, Evangelical Prelate in Heidelberg (Reformers before the Reformation), was to restore the pure primeval, the divine life of freedom, innocence, and nature. . . . To bring this about in defiance of the imposing power of the Church, the only way open to them was by secret and clandestine meetings. Accordingly they constructed for themselves remote, and often subterraneous habitations, which they called 'Paradises,' and where by night, and especially on the nights of festivals, persons of both sexes used to assemble. On such occasions one of their 'apostles' came forward, and, taking off his clothes and exemplifying in his own person the state of innocence, delivered a discourse on the free intercourse of the sexes, which the law of marriage, contrary to nature, had supplanted. The sequel, if we may credit the reports (Mosheim says there is no reason to doubt their truth—*de Beghardis et Beguinabus.*—Tr.), was of a kind which forbids description." (Tr.)

Gerard's death did not put an end to their sect. They found a new leader in *Dolcino*[1] of Prato, in the county of Novara, an Italian of considerable culture and remarkable energy of character, and some military talent. He introduced himself to public notice by a circular letter, addressed to all Christendom, in which he proclaimed that a "new age was dawning on the Church, and that he and his followers were the latter prophets who were to immediately precede the great Judgment Day" (A. D. 1303). The duration of the kingdom of God on earth, he said, was divided into four periods, each having its distinctive characteristics. The *first* embraced the time spent by Christ on earth, and was distinguished by piety, as exemplified in Jesus; the *second*, the interval from the death of Christ to Constantine, during which Christians were poor and chaste; the *third*, the centuries from Constantine to his own coming, during the first three or four of which the Christians were moderately good, but after the time of Charlemagne, they grew avaricious, and wealth corrupted the Church; St. Bernard and the Mendicant Orders made strenuous but ineffectual efforts to correct these abuses, but the latter ended by succumbing to their influence; the *fourth*, his own age, when virtue and chastity were to reign supreme, the power of Rome and of Pope Boniface VIII. to be overthrown, and Christianity to be restored in all its primitive purity.

---

[1] Histor. Dulcini and additamentum ad hist. Dulc. (*Muratori*, T. IX., p. 423.) *Dante*, Div. commed., inferno, Canto XXVIII., v. 55 (not v. 25), places *Dolcino* by the side of *Mohammed*, probably because they both defended their doctrines sword in hand. The poet commences his narrative with these words:

"Chi poria mai pur con parole sciolte
Dicer del sangue e delle piaghe appieno,
Ch' i' ora vidi, per narrar più volte?"

And the importance of the rebellious war thus carried on by them is shown then (v. 55 sq.), when Mohammed bids the poet, on his return to the light:

"Or di' a fra Dolcin dunque che s'armi,
Tu che forse vedrai il sole in breve,
S'egli non vuol qui tosto sequitarmi,
Sì di vivanda, che stretta di neve
Non rechi la vittoria al Noarese,
Ch' altrimenti acquistar non saria leve."

"Now say to Fra Dolcino, then, to arm him,
Thou, who perhaps wilt shortly see the sun,
If soon he wish not here to follow me,
So with provisions, that no stress of snow
May give the victory to the Novarese,
Which otherwise to gain would not be easy." (Tr.)

Mosheim, Hist. of the Order of Apostolicals, Helmstädt, 1748. *Schlosser*, Abelard and Dolcino, Gotha, 1807. *Krone*, Fra Dolcino and the Patareni, Lps. 1844.

It was rather unfortunate for Dolcino that he was often under the necessity of putting off this happy consummation of things; but, as he was equal to any emergency, the delays were not a source of insuperable annoyance to himself, whatever they may have been to his followers.

After going about for some time in Tyrol and Dalmatia, he returned to Piedmont, and, having gathered together his followers at Novara, formally declared war against Rome (A. D. 1304). After fighting several battles, Dolcino and his followers were driven to seek refuge on Mount Zebello, where those who escaped death by famine perished by the sword of the crusaders sent against them under the lead of the Bishop of Vercelli (A. D. 1307). Both Dolcino and his female companion, Margaret, whom he called his spiritual sister, were taken prisoners, and, after having borne severe torture, the former was executed and the latter burned to death. From this time forth the *Apostolicals* ceased to exist as an organized sect, though small communities were to be found scattered here and there, in Germany and in the south of France, as late as the opening of the fourteenth century.

The errors of these sectaries are very closely allied to the teachings of *Joachim*, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of *Floris*, in Calabria, from whose writings they were probably derived. He was born in 1130, and died in 1202.[1] He was an enthusiastic student of the Old Testament prophecies, which are the subject of many of his writings and discourses. He treated them in such way as to make pointed application of them to himself, and people came finally to regard him as a prophet. His writings under the title of "*Prophecies of the Abbot Joachim*" are well known to every student of mediaeval history. He also wrote a treatise on the Trinity, in which he controverted the teaching of Peter Lombard, saying that the latter, in maintaining that there are Three Persons in the Trinity, was really contending for a Quadrinity rather than a Trinity. He thus fell into an error very nearly akin to Tritheism. His teaching was condemned in the second canon of the fourth Council of Lateran (A. D. 1215). The apocalyptical tone of Joachim's writings led many of his followers into the wildest fanaticism.

Gerard, a Franciscan friar (c. A. D. 1254) and an intimate friend of John of Parma, for a time general of the Franciscan order, but subsequently deposed, collected three works of Joachim into one, under the title of the "*Everlasting Gospel*," with a doctrinal preface and some interpolations, here and there, of his own.[2] This, he said, was the gospel to which reference was made in the Apocalypse (xiv. 6), and which St. Francis, the founder of his order, who was mentioned in the same place as "the angel," was commissioned to proclaim to the world. Its leading idea is very nearly like that already set forth by the Montanists.[1] The Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity are supposed to typify the *Three Ages of the World*, or the three periods of the history of mankind. In the first age, embracing the interval from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ, the *Father* made Himself known to the *Jews* through the Old Testament and in manifestations of His power and majesty. In the second, the *Son* revealed Himself in the Gospels, gave in His own person a perfect example of humility, and imparted to man the fullness of wisdom and truth. To this dispensation of the Son, during which the *Roman Church* put forth her greatest energy, were to succeed the "*Last Days*," when the *Holy Ghost* would crown all that had gone before with perfect love and joy and freedom. For it was said that, inasmuch as the teaching of Christ and His apostles related to an earthly kingdom, and could not therefore lead man to his highest attainable end, Christianity as hitherto understood was speedily passing away, to be replaced by a spiritual religion of the heart, in which a contemplative love would supersede the sacraments and all outward means of grace. This sublime religion, with its higher life and superior knowledge, was to be the characteristic of the *Third Age of the World*, which was to open exactly in the year 1260. This age, it was added, was the only *purely spiritual age*—the first being that of the *flesh*, and the second that of the *flesh and the spirit*. The *false mysticism*, so prominent a feature of all these sectaries, received its highest development in the famous and learned *Master Eckhart of Paris* (A. D. 1300–1329). His sermons are often almost *unintelligible*, but the drift of them is plain enough, which is to allegorize all the historical portions of the Scriptures in such way as to bring them into harmony with his own *pantheistic theosophy*.[2] Efforts have been made to clear his otherwise great name of this heretical blot; but, since he was the first of those who were intimately connected with the sect known as the *Friends of God*,[1] it is not clear how he can be acquitted of the dangerous doctrines laid to his charge. Moreover, he was formally condemned by Pope John XXII., in a bull issued in 1329, after Eckhart's death. But, whatever be his faults, he has the incontestable merit of having thrown the German language into *scientific form.*

---

[1] It is not certain that the treatise "*Evangelium Aeternum*" existed in the Middle Ages. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Dissertations on Eccl. Hist., Erlangen, 1832, p. 1-150. "Joachim and the Everlasting Gospel." On the other hand, we have from Joachim: De concordia utriusque Testamenti, Libri V., Venet. 1519, 4to; Exposit. Apocal., psalterium decem chordarum (on the Trinity), Venet. 1527, 4to.

[2] Introductorius in evangel. aeternum, whereof but fragments in *Argentré* Collect. judicior. de novis errorib., Par. 1728, T. I., p. 173, and in *Eccard.*, T. II., p. 849; Postilla super apocal., epitomized in *Baluz.* Miscell., Lib. I., p. 213 sq.

---

[1] *Tertull.*, de virgin. veland., c. 1. Cf. ad uxor., Lib. I., c. 2.

[2] *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 641; a more critical view in **Greith*, German Mystics among the Friars and Preachers, Freiburg, 1861, p. 60 sq., and in *Bach*, Master Eckhart, the Father of German Speculation, Vienna, 1864. Cf. Tübg. Quart. 1865, nro. 1. *Lasson*, Master Eckhart, Berlin, 1868.

---

[1] Cf. *Blunt's* Dict. of Sects, etc., art. Friends of God. (Tr.)

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

Holstenii Codex regular. monasticar., etc. The works of *Helyot*, *Schmidt*, *Biedenfeld*, and **Henrion* (German by Fehr, Vol. I., p. 748). There is also found a full and very interesting picture of religious life at this epoch in *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. III., p. 427–616; Vol. IV., p. 1–312. See also *Cesare Cantù*, Vol. VII., p. 149 sq., and compare *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. IV., p. 320–436, and also *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXVII.

§ 239. *Introduction.*

The fresh, vigorous life which had penetrated the religious orders toward the close of the preceding epoch still continued to animate them in the present, and to make their influence felt throughout the whole Church and in every phase of her development. The spirit of penance having been revived in the Western nations during the eleventh century, by the reformatory zeal of Gregory VII., was kept alive by the labors of the monks, who were to be seen in the life and bustle of the world, now fearlessly preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ before princes and bishops, now acting as mediators between hostile parties and adjusting their difficulties, and at all times and everywhere proving themselves the friends and protectors of the poor. The cloister was alike the refuge of penitent sinners and the home of science, to which quiet and retirement are so congenial. Here schools were founded and flourished, the arts cultivated, and artisans and mechanics taught their various crafts and trades. A cloister, therefore, was, on a small scale, the seat of a university—a sort of polytechnic institute and agricultural college.[1] Moreover, the monasteries were governed by rules exhibiting such consummate wisdom that their forms of government were in a measure adopted as models for political institutions just emerging into life and taking definite shape. So generally acceptable was monastic life to all classes, and so rapid and wide-spread its growth, that *Innocent III.* felt himself called upon to forbid the founding of new orders, and left to restless and aspiring men only the choice of entering whichever of those already existing they might find most congenial to their tastes Still his prohibition did not prevent the founding of many new congregations, whose members went earnestly to work to counteract the influence of heretics, those dangerous enemies of Church and State then as in all ages, and, as the event proved, achieved by their labors a most triumphant success.

---

[1] "The mere enumeration of the cloister libraries fills one with surprise and admiration. About the close of the eleventh century, the library of the monastery of Croyland, containing three thousand volumes, perished by fire. In 1248 the library of the abbey of Glastonbury contained four hundred volumes, among which were several of the Roman poets and historians. The catalogue

The secret of the strength and influence of the religious orders and congregations lay in the severity of their rules, their strict observance of them, and in the holiness of their founders. But unfortunately a spirit of laxity *soon* crept in, and the conspicuous contrast between their vow of poverty and their great wealth and vast possessions foreboded, and in matter of fact brought on, their speedy decline. Once introduced, the taste for refined and sensual enjoyments rapidly spread; the monastic state, heretofore so sacred and honored in the eyes of all, was regarded with indifference or excited contempt, and monks became either secretly vicious or openly scandalous.

THE CONGREGATION OF CLUGNY (cf. § 199).

This congregation, the most celebrated of the past epoch, was also the most renowned of the present. Its members wore a black habit of the simplest possible cut. The disci-

---

of the library of Prifling is not so rich in classical works, but among them a Homer is mentioned. About the same epoch, the cloister of Benedictbeuren boasted of the possession of a Lucian, a Horace, a Virgil, and a Sallust; and the monastery of St. Michael, near Bamberg, had among its collection the greater part of the Latin poets and the works of many other writers of Pagan and Christian antiquity." *Hurter*, Vol. III., p. 582; cf. *Cantù*, Vol. VII., p. 754.

pline of the monastery had been very dangerously relaxed during the abbacy of one *Pontius*, who died in 1122; but his successor, the learned and virtuous *Peter the Venerable* (A. D. 1122–1156), again restored it to its primitive rigor, and extended the reputation and the authority of the mother-house of Clugny until it had under it two thousand monasteries,[1] chiefly in France. All these monasteries, which, as we have already remarked, were generally built on *picturesque and commanding heights*,[2] were subject to the rule and under the government of Clugny, and recognized its abbot as their supreme monastic head. He was invariably chosen from the monks of his own convent, whence also the priors of the other convents were, as a rule, taken. A *General Chapter* assembled annually at Clugny, to enact laws and provide for the interests of the congregation. This congregation now, as in times past, continued to send forth popes and bishops to govern the Church, and in return the order enjoyed the protection and prospered under the influence of the pontiffs, but more particularly in France than elsewhere. But excessive wealth, as usual, blighted the life and blasted the growth of this great and noble order, and Clugny declined in consideration and influence, and finally gave place to rising congregations more fitted by their constitution and the fresh vigor of their youth to cope with the perils of the age.

§ 240. *The Cistercian Order.*

Relatio, qualiter incepit ordo Cisterciens. (*Auberti Miraei* Chron. Cisterc. ord., Coloniae, 1614). — *Henriquez*, Regula, constitut. et privil. ord. Cist., Antverp., 1630. *Holstenius-Brockie*, l. c., T. II., p. 365–468. *Helyot*, Vol. V., p. 346 sq. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 164–206. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 101 sq.

Robert, abbot of Molesme, growing dissatisfied with the relaxation and sloth into which excessive wealth had plunged the Benedictine order, and still more so with the resistance which the monks offered to his measures of reform, founded, in 1098, a new congregation at Cîteaux, near *Dijon*, in the bishopric of Châlons-sur-Marne. The pious abbot had a host of difficulties to contend against and overcome. The spirit which animated the new congregation of Cîteaux was as different as possible from that which swayed the monks of Clugny, and an absolute *self-denial*, a severe simplicity in all that pertained to external worship, a full and unqualified *submission to the authority of the bishop of the diocese*, a complete renunciation of *all* worldly affairs, and, in fact, everything about them, down to the *white* habit, which had been substituted for the black, rendered the contrast more conspicuous and pronounced.

---

[1] *Wilkens*, Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, being the biography of a monk, Lps. 1857.

[2] In the Middle Ages everything had, so to speak, its special and distinctive type and its own appropriate names. Each order and congregation had a traditional *location* and a peculiar *style of architecture*. The sites preferred by each of the great orders is expressed in the following verses:

> Bernardus *valles*, *montes* Benedictus amabat
> *Oppida* Franciscus, *celebres* Ignatius *urbes*.

Robert died 1108, and 1119 his order was thrown into definite shape and its organization perfected by the adoption of the *Charter of Love* (*Charta Charitatis*), which directed that every act of its members should be done by the law of charity. It was approved in the same year by Calixtus II. Its rule was so severe that three abbots succeeded one another before any accession was made to the original twenty, and even some of these were frightened away by the austerity it enjoined.[1] But, for all this, contemporaries recognized in the life led by the inmates of Cîteaux the perfect antitype of the apostolic age, and when *St. Bernard* became one of their number, in 1113, the order had acquired a reputation which raised it far above the most illustrious congregations of that day.

Nearly three years later, he founded a new monastery of the same order in a wild and desert valley inclosed by mountains, in the diocese of Langres. The valley had formerly been the asylum of robbers, and was called the Valley of Wormwood (*Vallis Absinthalis*), but after it had been cleared, it received the name of the Clear Valley (*Clara Vallis*), and the new house was in consequence called *Clairvaux*. Bernard was at this time only five and twenty. He was consecrated abbot by *William of Champeaux*, the learned Bishop of Châlons (1115).[1]

---

[1] *Dalgairns*, St. Stephen Harding, founder (?) (third abbot!—Tr.) of the Order of Citeaux, Mentz, 1855.

St. Bernard was born in 1091, at *Fontaine-Duémois*, near Chatilly in Burgundy. He was of noble parentage, his father being a respectable knight. His mother, Aleth, as so frequently happens in the case of great men, was at special pains to instill into his tender mind those sentiments of piety and religion which, when assiduously cultivated in early life, are rarely, if ever, lost sight of in after years, and never cease to exercise some influence for good. Previously to Bernard's birth, his mother had learned in a vision that her son would one day be the keeper of the house of the Lord, and, according to her custom, as soon as she was able to go abroad, she brought him to the altar and consecrated him to God.

Bernard was early sent to school, where he soon distanced his companions in speculative studies and dialectical skill, and from his most tender years manifested a grave and peaceable disposition, and a decided tendency to a life of solitude and contemplation. He used to say in after life, when thrown among the noise and bustle of the world, that his mind had been nurtured and his soul inspired by long residence among the grand old trees of the forest. After the death of his mother, the young man was drawn into the society of youths, whose morals were such as are usually associated with that season of life when the passions are strong and fiery and the mind ill-balanced, and was for a time in danger of being led into unseemly excesses. But by the aid of the lessons taught him in early life by his pious mother, he quickly recovered himself, broke loose from all worldly ties, and, gathering about him thirty young men of kindred dispositions and aspirations, entered the monastery of Cîteaux (A. D. 1113).

---

[1] *Bernardi* Opp. (letters, speeches, poems, practical exegetics, ascetical writings.) Best edition that of *Merlo Horst*, revised by *Mabillon*, Paris, 1667–1690, 6 vols. in fol. 1719, 2 vols. f.; Venet. 1726, 2 vols. f. in *Migne*, ser. lat. T. 182-185. A beautiful reprint of the edition of Mabillon by the Frères de Gaume, Paris, 1839–40. His life was written by three of his contemporaries—*William*, abbot of Saint-Thierry, *Gaufred.*, and *Alanus* ab Insulis, monks of Clairvaux (*Mabillon*, Acta SS. ord. S. Bened., T. I. and IV.) Among moderns, see *Neander*, St. Bernard and his Age, 2 ed., Berlin, 1848; *Ratisbonne*, Vie de saint Bernard, Paris, 1843. See above, p. 538.

Having, with the exception of a short interval, severely chastened his passions and disciplined his conscience through life, he was now prepared to take in and bring home to himself, as far as is given man to do, the most sublime teachings of the Church. Equally distinguished by great learning and practical good sense, and by a deep and sincere humility and a dislike of any sort of honor, this wonderful man had a remarkable tact in meeting and overcoming, when he could not set aside, difficulties; and his eloquence, backed by his ascetic appearance, his self-denial, and his numerous miracles enabled him to carry out successfully the most difficult undertakings.

Bernard was the type of his age. Who knew so well as he how to meet the various forms of fanaticism of that age when the incoherent vagaries of an unchastened imagination and a stubborn and indocile reason mingled, like the remembrance of some hideous dream, with the intellectual awakening then going on? Enamored of the *Church* and of the high ideal he had formed of her, he knew better than any other the *disorders* by which she was afflicted, and fearlessly attacked them wherever found, whether among the clergy or the laity, in popes, in bishops, or in princes, and having thus rebuked their shortcomings, gave them salutary advice as to their future conduct. To him did Innocent II. owe his recognition as pope, and Eugene III. the great influence which he enjoyed; on his recommendation the Knights Templars, already somewhat relaxed, received the sanction of the Holy See, and to his sweeping eloquence and energy is due the organization of the *Second Crusade;* and, finally, to his zeal and apostolic labors many fanatical heretics owed their conversion and return to the Church. What a number of projects did this one man undertake and successfully carry through single-handed! By a life of self-denial and meditation, he rivaled the perfection of the most renowned anchorites of the East, and in the energy and activity he displayed in consulting for the temporal and eternal welfare of his fellow-man, was not surpassed by any prince or bishop of his day. This powerful representative of the spiritual element, this angel of peace among men, this arbiter between kings and nations, did not long survive his friend, Pope Eugene, whom he followed to the tomb August 20, 1153. No sooner had the news of his death got abroad than petitions came pouring in from all countries, praying for his canonization, and he was accordingly placed upon the calendar of saints in 1174.

The monastery of Clairveaux was a model of monastic life, and so great an authority and influence did the order acquire through the reputation of Bernard that its members were led to call themselves *Bernardines.* Before his death his order had spread to every country of Europe, and numbered two thousand establishments.[1] From all quarters—from every part of France, from Italy and Spain, from Germany and Switzerland, from England and Ireland, and from Denmark and Sweden—came applications for monks formed at Clairveaux to found monasteries in these distant lands on the model left by Bernard. There in that desert valley, at the foot of solitary mountains, did the turmoil of the world cease, and in those tranquil cells did countless souls find peace and rest, and many a broken heart solace and repose. "Ah, how much happier am I," writes a monk of Cîteaux, "in cultivating wisdom, here in one of our humble huts, than in living with my friend amid the magnificence of great cities!"

The chronicles of this order are crowded with the lives of saints. From it went forth great statesmen and rulers of the Church. To it does agriculture owe a large debt of gratitude, and the lower classes much of the amelioration of their condition. Its influence was everywhere felt; and even religious, usually very tenacious and jealous of their own rules and traditions, sometimes reformed their own monasteries on the model of Clairveaux. It was thus that *Suger*, the celebrated monk and statesman, reformed the monastery of *St. Denys*, of which he was abbot.

---

[1] *Dubois*, Hist. of the Abbey of Morimond, and of the principal equestrian orders of Spain and Portugal, Münster, 1855, from the second French edition of Dijon, 1852.

§ 241. *The Order of Grammont* (*Grand Mont*).

Historia brevis prior. Grandimontensium; Historia prolixior prior. Grandimontensium et Vita S. Stephani, ord. Grand. institutoris, by *Gerhard*, the seventh prior of Grammont (*Martène* et *Durand*, Collect ampliss., T. VI., p. 113 sq., 125 sq., and 1050 sq.; *Mabillon*, Annal. ord. S. Bened., T. V., p. 65); the statutes of the order in Martène, de antiq. eccles. ritibus. *Helyot*, Vol. VII., p. 470 sq. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 137 sq.

Stephen of Tigerno, in Auvergne, was born in 1046. His parents had long and earnestly sought God to bless them with a son, and when Stephen was born to them, great pains were taken to have him properly brought up and educated. When twelve years of age, he accompanied his father on a pilgrmage to the tomb of St. Nicholas of Bari; but, falling sick on his return, he was placed under the care of his countryman, Archbishop Milon of Benevento, who had him suitably educated for the ministry. During a visit to a monastery in Calabria, the young man's thoughts took another direction, and, being strongly impressed by the quiet, order, and beauty of monastic life, returned to France and founded the new order of *Grammont.* It received the special approbation of Gregory VII. (A. D. 1073), who, in writing to Stephen, told him "to found as many houses as there are stars in the heavens, and to beg of St. Benedict to obtain for him spiritual graces rather than temporal blessings." In compliance with the wish of the Pope, Stephen at first adopted the Benedictine rule for his community; but later on, when his religious came to ask him to what order they belonged: "To that of the Gospel," he replied, "which is the basis of all rules. Let this be your answer to such as inquire of you. As for myself, I shall not suffer that I be called either monk, canon, or hermit. These titles are so high and holy, and imply so large a measure of perfection, that I should not presume to apply them to myself."

His own austerity, and that which he required in those about him, soon drew to his side a number of followers, with whom he settled first at Mount *Muret*, Limoge; but, having been forced to give up this place, he fixed his abode permanently at Grammont, a few (five) miles distant.

Stephen of Tigerno died February 8, 1124, leaving to his brethren only the legacy of poverty and an abiding trust in God. His spiritual children proved themselves worthy followers of their holy founder. The first written Rule of the order is attributed to both Stephen of Lisiac, the fourth, and to Gerard, the seventh prior (A. D. 1188), and enjoins the most strict observance of the vow of poverty, forbidding the community to *receive or hold any estates or possessions whatever.* "Never," says the Rule, "is one as secure of the Divine love as when living in poverty. It is therefore necessary to observe it most scrupulously." And, to put the observance of it beyond all doubt, the Rule further prescribed, "*that the administration of all temporal affairs shall be intrusted to lay-brothers.*" But it was precisely this precaution against the laxity to which excessive wealth usually leads that, in course of time, disturbed the peace of the order and seriously injured the good name which the holiness of so many of its members had merited for it. Monks and lay-brothers fell to quarreling with each other, and the latter, having possession of all the wealth of the monastery, administered it to the detriment of the former. In 1317, Pope John XXII. reformed the Rule and raised Grammont to the rank of an abbey, having under it thirty-nine priories.

§ 242. *The Carthusians.*

The Life of *St. Bruno* (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. Octob., T. III., p. 491 sq.) *Mabillon,* Ann., T. V., p. 202; ejusdem Acta SS. O. S. Bened., T. VI., P. II., praef. p 52. See also the awful legend de vera causa secessus St. Brunon. in eremum (*Launoi,* Opp., T. II., Pt. II., p. 324 sq.) *Dubois,* la grande chartreuse, Grenoble, 1846. The statutes of the order of Carthusians first ordered by *Guigo de Castro,* author of the Vita S. Hugonis Grandinopolitani, in *Surius,* and the *Bollandists,* ad. I. m. April. Cf. *Helyot,* Vol. VII., p. 424 sq. *Hurter,* Vol. IV., p. 149 sq. *Henrion-Fehr,* Vol. I., p. 78 sq. Historical and Political Papers, Vol. VIII., p. 328 sq.

Bruno, a priest *of Cologne,* and afterward canon and master of the cathedral-school at Rheims, where *Urban II.* was one of his pupils, was the founder of this order. Disgusted with the worldly life of Manasseh, the archbishop, who on one occasion so far forgot himself as to say that "the archbishopric of Rheims would be a fine thing if one were not obliged to sing Mass to enjoy its revenues," and, frightened by some singular occurrences attending the death of one of the canons,[1] he, in company with a few others who shared his sentiments, retired into the diocese of Grenoble, where they were warmly received by Hugh, the bishop. In a wild and desolate valley, called *La Chartreuse* (*Carthusium*), situated within a few miles of the city of Grenoble, he and his dozen companions settled down and laid the foundation of an order *more severe in discipline than any then existing.* They built a monastery in which to meet for religious and devotional exercises, and lived in small cells scattered about it. Their rule prescribed perpetual silence, total abstinence from flesh-meat, and the wearing of hair-cloth garments. But, while devising bodily austerities, Bruno did not neglect to inspire his brethren with his own *love of knowledge.*[2] Their time was divided between religious exercises, manual labor, and the transcription of the Bible, ancient authors, and other important works, thus securing for themselves the best title to the grateful remembrance of posterity. They rigidly excluded all appearance of pomp and magnificence, and, even in the service of the altar, permitted the use of only a silver chalice. The order flourished in spite of the severity of the rule, and even a band of devoted women took up the idea and founded a corresponding community for females, who were called Carthusian nuns.[3]

---

[1] This shocking legend is probably allegorical, and contains some pointed reference to the disorders laid to the charge of Manasseh. It states that one of the canons, having died, was lying coffined in church during the recitation of the office of the dead. When the canons had come to the words of the fourth lesson—"Responde mihi"—the dead man thrice raised his head, repeating, each time: "By the just judgment of God am I accused, found guilty, and condemned." The authenticity of the legend has been vehemently denied by Launoy, Archbishop Antoninus, Gerson, and especially by *Mabillon*, Museum Ital., T. I., Pt. II., p. 117 sq. On the other hand, it is defended by *Don Ducreux*, last prior of the Carthusian monastery of Bourbon-le-Gaillon, in Normandy, in his biography of St. Bruno. See *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 79, in the note. † *Tappert*, St. Bruno, Luxemburg, 1872.

[2] Cf. *Alb. Miraeus*, Bibliotheca Carthusiana, sive illustrium S. Carthus. ordin. scriptorum, auctore *Theodor. Petrejo* (acced. origines omn. per orbem Carthusianorum), Coloniae, 1609.

[3] They were first established at Salette, on the Rhone, in France, about the year 1229. (Tr.)

The deep spiritual life which distinguished the monks of Chartreuse gave their influence much weight in the great controversy on investitures. The austere Bruno was invited (A. D. 1090) by Urban II., his former pupil, to come to Rome; but the holy man soon grew weary of the active life of a court, and, after refusing the bishopric of Reggio, retired to Torre, in *Calabria*, where he founded a new Carthusian monastery and ended his days in 1101.

The Carthusian monks preserved unimpaired, perhaps longer than those of any other order, the spirit of their founder, the primitive severity of their rule, and their characteristic love of contemplative life. Even amid the splendor with which the order was afterward surrounded, these remained free from all external contact, and the traditional austerity of the monks lost nothing of its severity.[1]

Guigo, the fifth *prior* of the mother-house of Chartreuse († A. D. 1137), composed a valuable work for his order, entitled the "*Monk's Ladder*," in which he gives a striking picture of an ascetical life. "There are," says he, "four stages of growth in holiness, nearly, if not quite, inseparable from each other—viz., *reading*, *meditation*, *prayer*, and *contemplation*. By reading, one is drawn to meditation, and this, accompanied by prayer, leads to the domain of pure contemplation. Reading conveys the food to the mouth, meditation breaks and grinds it; prayer creates and tastes, but contemplation is enjoyment itself. As in certain pleasures of sense the spiritual element in man becomes so intimately interwoven with the corporal that matter for the time wholly predominates, so also in contemplation every movement and impulse of the flesh are so completely under control of the soul, and so responsive to its workings, that matter and spirit are entirely one, move on in the fullest harmony, and the spiritual element rules supreme. Some hasten to Jerusalem, but do ye push on still further, nor cease until ye have acquired patience and humility. Ye may find the Holy City in this world, but the home of these virtues is beyond."

---

[1] Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 90–94. Description of the Carthusian Establishments.

In 1141 it was first proposed to convoke a general chapter of the order at the Chartreuse of Grenoble, over which the prior of this house presided, and at which the priors of all the other monasteries were present. It was here agreed that the general chapter had the right and the duty to legislate for the whole order, and to look after the general good of its various establishments.

§ 243. *The Premonstratensians or Norbertines.*

Norberti Vita by the Jesuit Papebroch (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. Jun., T. I., p 804). *Hermanni monachi*, De miraculis S. Mariae laudes III. 2 sq. (*Guiberti* Opp. ed. *d'Achéry*, p. 544.) *Hugo*, Vie S. Norbert., Luxemb. 1704, 4to. Bibl. Ord. Praem. per *J. le Paige*, Par. 1633; primaria instituta canonic. Praemonstr. in *Martène*. de antiq. eccles. ritib., T. III. Cf. *Helyot*, Vol. II., p. 206 sq. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 200 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 148 sq. *Görlich*, the Premonstr. and their abbey of St. Vincent, at Breslau, 2 pts., Bresl. 1836–1841. *Winter*, the Premonst. of the twelfth century, being supplements toward a history of the introduction of Christianity into the country of the Wends, Berlin, 1865. *The same*, the Premonstratensians in North-eastern Germany, Gotha, 1868.

The founder of this order, *Norbert*, a descendant of the noble house of Gennep, was born at Xanten, on the Lower Rhine, in the duchy of Cleves, between the years 1080 and 1085. Being a man of good parts, and having a large fortune in his own right, the highest ecclesiastical offices were open to him, and during the early years of his priesthood he was chaplain to the emperor Henry V., and, still later, canon at Cologne. While indulging hopes of worldly ambition and of a brilliant future, an event occurred which changed the whole course of his life. In 1114, while out taking a ride for pleasure, he was overtaken by a storm and dashed to the ground by a stroke of lightning which fell near him. On recovering himself, he began to think seriously of the sudden death he had just escaped, and, interpreting the circumstance as a warning, he at once entered upon a more serious course of life. After having distributed his goods to the poor, he attempted to reform the canons of several cathedrals; but failing here, he went up and down France and Germany preaching penance. He was everywhere received with marked demonstrations of respect. Shepherds would leave their flocks to make known his coming to hamlet and town, and as he drew near, the church-bells would ring out to announce his presence to the inhabitants. Hastening to the church, he would celebrate Mass, after which he would preach to the people. His grave and manly eloquence always produced a lively and lasting impression. Young and old yielded to its persuasive influence, and knights prepared for deadly combat, when accosted by Norbert, would lay aside their arms, become reconciled, and embrace as friends. All were emulous of the honor of entertaining this man of peace as their guest.

In the year 1119, Norbert visited Pope Calixtus II., who was then holding a council at Rheims, and was by him authorized to found a new order. In the following year he withdrew, for this purpose, to an unhealthy and desert valley in the forest of *Coucy*, near Laon, which he named *Prémontré* (*Pratum Monstratum*), or "the indicated meadow," from the fact that it had been pointed out to him in a vision. Acting under the instructions of Bartholomew, Bishop of Laon, Norbert put off the garb of a penitent and assumed the *white* habit. The *constitutions of St. Augustine*[1] formed the basis of the Rule adopted by this new order of reformed canons, who, while living strictly the lives of monks, united to the habit of contemplation and study, preaching and the care of souls.[2] The order was confirmed by Pope Honorius II. in 1126.

Norbert, although reasonably zealous in advancing the prosperity of his new foundation, never boasted of any special excellence possessed by it or endeavored to lay its obligations on others. To the pious and aged Theobald, Count of Champagne, who wished to enter the order and make over to it all his possessions, he replied: "Far be it from me to interrupt the work God is accomplishing through you. Bear in mind that by taking this step the good you are now doing as a prince would have to be left undone."

---

[1] The Rule in its present form did not originate with *St. Augustine*. It is a compilation from his two sermons *On the Morals of the Clergy* and from his one hundred and ninth letter to the *Nuns of Hippo*. Particular statutes were added to this compilation later on.

[2] There arose a discussion between monks and canons as to which of the conditions of life was the more honorable and meritorious. For arguments in favor of the latter, see *Lamb.*, Abb. S. Rufi ep. ad Ogerium (*Martène*, Thesaur., T. I., p. 329 sq.) For the former, *Abaelard.* ep. III., *Ruperti Tuit.* sup. quaed. capitula reg. Ben. (Opp., T. II., p. 965.)

When, in 1126, Norbert went to preach at the diet of Spire, he was, as if by a divine inspiration, elected to the vacant archbishopric of Magdeburg. He at first stoutly refused to accept the proffered honor; but, finally yielding, made his entrance into his metropolitan city in the garb of a beggar, the poverty of his garments contrasting strangely with the rich apparel of those composing his retinue. As time went on, his austerity became equally hateful to clergy and people, and he was obliged to fly the city. He died in 1134, while returning from Italy, where he held the office of chancellor, and his death, while calling forth the most lively demonstrations of regret, hushed every expression of ill-will against him. He was called by St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable the holiest and most eloquent man of his age.

§ 244. *The Carmelites and the Order of Fontevrault.*

Joan. Phocas (1185), Compendiaria descriptio castror. et urbium ab urbe Antiochia usque ad Hierosolym. (Leon. Allatii Symmicta., Venet. 1733 f.) *Jacob. de Vitriaco,* Hist. Hierosolym., c. 52 (Bongars., P. I., p. 1075). *Alberti* regula in *Holstenius.,* T. III., p. 18 sq. *Dan.* a *Virg. Maria,* Speculum Carmelitar., Antverp, 1680, IV. T. f. *Helyot,* Vol. I., p. 347 sq. *Hurter,* Vol. IV., p. 211 sq. *Freiburg Cyclop.,* Vol II., p. 362 sq.

The founder of the Carmelites was one *Berthold,* a monk and priest of Calabria, who with a few companions erected, in 1156, a few huts on the heights of Mount Carmel, not far from the cave which the prophet Elias had blessed by his presence. The huts were soon demolished to give place to a monastery. Mount Carmel, from its connection with the names of Elias and Eliseus,[1] had been for centuries inhabited by anchorets desirous to perpetuate the memory of these prophets, and hence the Carmelites claimed Elias himself as their founder.[2]

Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, at the request of *Brocard,* the second abbot, gave a Rule to the order (A. D. 1209). It was very severe, and enjoined, among other austerities, absolute poverty, the complete seclusion of the monks in separate cells, and total abstinence from flesh-meat.

---

[1] III. Kings xviii. 19 sq.; IV. Kings ii. 25., iv. 25.

[2] *Papebroch* has got at the truth of this affair in some of his treatises (*Bolland.,* mens. Apr., T. I., p. 774 sq.)

The order was approved in 1224 by Honorius III. Driven from their monastery by the encroachments of the Saracens, the Carmelites wandered into Europe, where, giving up the life of anchorets, they received from Pope Innocent IV. estates for their use, and by his authority changed their name to *Brothers of our Lady of Mount Carmel.*

According to a pious legend, *Simon Stock,*[1] an Englishman, the sixth general of the order, received from the Blessed Virgin the scapular (*scapulare*), so called from being worn upon the shoulders, with the promise that whosoever should have it on when dying would escape eternal punishment.

In 1245 the Carmelites became one of the *Mendicant orders,* but after Pope Eugene had so modified their Rule (A. D. 1431) as to adapt it to the climate and changed circumstances of the West, they split into two divisions—one of which called themselves the *Conventuals,* or the *Shod,* and the other the *Observants,* or the *Unshod.* They subsequently coalesced with similar orders of nuns and with numerous *confraternities of the Scapular,* who specially aimed at honoring the Blessed Virgin, and devoted themselves to works of charity.

Very similar to these was the order of *Fontevrault,* whose members dedicated themselves in a special sense to *the honor and glory of the Queen of Heaven.*[2] They were founded by *Robert of Arbrissel* in 1094. Robert in his youth entered enthusiastically into the religious and scientific movement of his age, and having gone through his course of studies with great credit to himself, at Paris, became a professor of theology in that city, and was distinguished by his correct and ascetical life. The Bishop of Rennes, who was himself identified with the movement in favor of reform, made the young professor his coadjutor (A. D. 1085).

In his new position Robert showed great capacity, and was extremely zealous in his efforts to reform the morals of the clergy, to enforce the rule of celibacy, and to suppress simony. But after the death of this bishop, he gave up his efforts in despair, and took a professorship in the city of Angers, which, however, he soon threw up, and consecrated himself to a life of *penance and self-denial* in the forest of *Craon.* Roots and herbs were his food, and his couch the bare ground. His retreat was soon invaded by many desirous of sharing his mode of life, and they finally became so numerous that, as he himself informs us, he was obliged to make three divisions of them, distributing them in the neighboring forests. He next had a number of small cells built at *La Roe* (A. D. 1093), and gave their occupants the rule of St. Augustine for their guidance. Urban II. ordered him to preach the Crusade, and his words of burning eloquence fired all hearts. His preaching seems to have had a strange and magnetic influence. Young and old of both sexes, after listening to him, gave up their vicious habits, confessed their sins, and entered upon a new life.[1]

---

[1] *Launoy,* Diss. V. de Simon. Stockii visu, de Sabbathinae bullae privil. et Scapularis Carmelitar. sodalitate (Opp., T. II., Pt. II.)

[2] *Mabillon,* Annal., T. V., p. 314 sq. *Bolland.* Acta SS. mens. Febr., T. III., p. 593. *Helyot,* Vol. VI., p. 98 sq.

In the year 1100 he founded two houses at Fontevrault (*Fons Ebraldi*), not far from the town of Candes, in Poitou—the one for men and the other for women—which were soon too small to accommodate the crowds that flocked thither, and new ones had to be erected. The order was approved by Pope Paschal II. in 1106, and again in 1113.

Following the example of our Divine Savior, who, when dying, committed St. John, the well-beloved disciple, to the care of His mother, Robert placed all his convents, both of men and women, in the keeping of the Blessed Virgin, and made them all subject to the *Abbess of Notre-Dame-de-Fontevrault.*[2] Finally, he assigned them the difficult and delicate mission of reclaiming vicious women and leading them back to a life of virtue; and to this work, with a disregard for his own good name bordering on recklessness, did he devote the best energies of his life. He died in 1117.

---

[1] The biography of Bishop Balderic, in *Bolland.* d. 25 mens. Feb.

[2] Dissertationes de subjectione virorum etiam sacerdotum ad mulierem, etc., Paris, 1612; ed. II. as Clypeus Font. Ebrald. ordinis, Paris, 1692, 3 T. Conf. *Schels,* The Modern Religious Communities, Schaffhausen, 1857, p. 74 sq.

"How happy are you," said the faithful interpreter of the sentiments of his age, on beholding a young maiden enter the cloister, "how happy are you in that you have given up the sons of men and now chosen as your bridegroom the Son of the Most High! You shall be dear to him in proportion as your apparel is poor and your virginity spotless. You have done well to trample under foot the fleeting riches and insidious treasures of the world. From this time forth have no part with it; offer yourself, wholly and without reserve, as a sacrifice to your heavenly Bridegroom."[1]

§ 245. *Anthonists, Trinitarians, and Humiliati.*

There is no disease so loathsome, so repugnant to man's nature, or so offensive to his senses, that Christian charity may not be found warm and courageous enough to minister to such as are stricken with it. Hence, in those terrible days when appalling epidemics swept over Europe, scourging and desolating whole provinces, religious associations sprung up whose special purpose it was to minister to the corporal and spiritual wants of the sick and the pest-stricken. Besides the terrible plague of the *leprosy*, which had been brought into Europe from the East, there was another, known as the *Sacred Fire*, or *St. Anthony's Fire*, which carried off multitudes after they had suffered the most frightful pains; and those who were fortunate enough not to succumb to it were left either mutilated or incurably lame for the remainder of their days.

Among those attacked by this disorder was one *Guerin*, the son of a wealthy nobleman by the name of *Gaston*, who had also been stricken by it. Both had recourse to *St. Anthony*, and obtained their recovery. Out of gratitude for this blessing, the two made a pilgrimage to *Didier-la-Mothe*, where the saint was particularly venerated, and there consecrated their entire fortune to the foundation of an order whose work was to consist in serving and caring for those who were stricken with this and similar maladies. They were approved in 1096 by Pope Urban II., after which they took the name of *Anthonists*, or *Hospitalers*. Their habit was black, having an Egyptian cross (T) on the breast. The order, which was at first composed entirely of laymen, but subsequently, by permission of Boniface VIII., included canons, observed the rule of St. Augustine, under the direction of a superior called a Master (*magister*).[1] There was also another society of laymen and ecclesiastics devoted entirely to the laudable and laborious work of serving lepers.

---

[1] *Petr. Bles.*, ep. 55.

"These brothers," says James of Vitry, a contemporary († c. A. D. 1240), "by forcing themselves to it, endure, amidst filth and offensive odors, such intolerable hardships for Christ's sake, that it should seem no sort of penitential exercises imposed by man upon himself could for a moment be compared with this holy martyrdom, so precious in the sight of God."

John of Matha, a theologian of Paris, but a native of Provence, and *Felix of Valois* had simultaneously the same dream, and as Innocent III., in interpreting it, directed their thoughts toward the redemption of Christian captives taken by the Saracens, he may be regarded as the founder of the order of *Trinitarians*[2] (A. D. 1198), and did, in fact, draft its Rule. It was called, from its object, *Ordo de Redemptione Captivorum*, but its members were more generally known as *Trinitarians*. They wore a white habit, having a red and blue cross on the breast. They were well received in France, where they had originated, were the recipients of large sums of money to be devoted to the objects of the order, and had large accessions to their number, among whom were many distinguished by ability and profound learning.

In the year 1200 the first company of ransomed captives arrived from Morocco, and one may easily imagine their joy on again regaining their freedom and beholding once more their friends and native land.

The members of this order were sometimes called *Mathurins*, from the title of the first church occupied by them in Paris. They spread rapidly in Southern France, through Spain, Italy, England, Saxony, and Hungary, and foundations of a similar kind were also opened for women. *Cerfroid*, in the diocese of Meaux, where the first house of the order was opened, became the residence of the General (*minister generalis*). There was a fine field for their labors in Spain, where the Moors were constantly at war with the Christians.

---

[1] *Bolland.* mens. Jan., T. II., p. 160. — *Kapp*, de Fratrib. S. Antonii, Lps. 1737, 4to.

[2] *Bonaventura Baro*, Annal. ordin. S. Trin., Rom. 1684; regula, in *Holsten.*, T. III., p. 3 sq. See *Helyot*, Vol. II., p. 366 sq. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 213 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 132 sq. **Dr. Gmelin*, The Trinitarians or White Spaniards in Austria, and their activity in behalf of the liberation of Christian slaves from Turkish captivity (Austr. Quart. of Theol. 1871, nro. 3). *The same*, Bibliography for a history of the order of Trinitarians, Serapeum, 1870.

Another order having the same object in view, but differing somewhat in its constitution, was founded by *Peter of Nolasco*, a distinguished Frenchman, and *Raymond of Pennaforte*, in 1218, and, in consequence of a vision, placed under the special protection of the Blessed Virgin, and called the Order of the Blessed Virgin of Mercy (*Ordo B. Mariae de Mercede*). Its members bound themselves by vow to give their fortunes, to serve as soldiers, and, if necessary, to make a sacrifice of their very persons, as Peter actually did in Africa, for the redemption of Christian captives. Hence their members were divided into *Knights*, who wore a white uniform, and *Brothers*, who took orders and provided for the spiritual wants of the community. *Gregory IX.*, admiring the heroic devotion of these intrepid men, approved the order.

The *Humbled* (*Humiliati*)[1] occupied, as it were, an intermediate position between the world and the cloister. They were at first composed of a small number of families which Henry II., at the opening of the eleventh century, drove from the city of Milan and conducted as exiles into Germany, and of other gatherings drawn together for devotional purposes.

On the return of the Milanese exiles to their native city, they continued, from choice, the mode of religious exercise they had adopted from necessity while abroad; and so popular did these little communities become, that within a very short time they were to be found scattered in every considerable town throughout Lombardy. One of the primary rules of the society being that each member should earn his bread by the labor of his hands, its ranks were chiefly recruited from the mechanic class, and almost exclusively from those engaged in the preparation of wool and in the manufacture of woolen fabrics. Their dress was simple and modest, and their intercourse with each other kindly and characterized by the fear of God. Each member worked, not for himself, but for the interests of the society, which looked after and provided for the wants of all. Thus the youthful, the vigorous, and the strong compensated for the weak, the infirm, and the aged. All feelings of discontent were banished, and satisfaction and harmony filled the breast of every member of these little communities. Priests and monks soon joined their ranks. The society was daily growing in numbers, its movements becoming more complex and difficult, and the need of some steadying, some governing influence was evident. Accordingly, Innocent III. gave it the Rule of St. Benedict, but Gregory IX., in consideration of the sustained manual labor which the members were obliged to perform, materially modified the articles regulating fasting. A Grand Master was appointed in 1246. Their habits of indusdustry and their purity of morals gained them universal esteem, and sometimes raised them to high positions of public trust and honor. But, like so many other societies, this too, after having reached a position of influence and power, lost sight of the spiritual in its anxiety for its temporal and sordid interests, and mixed in the political intrigues of the day. St. Charles Borromeo attempted to reform its members, but they resisted, and, in return for his kindness, four of their number formed a plot to take his life. Bursting into the room of the saint while he was engaged in prayer, one of these assassins fired upon him, but his life was miraculously preserved, the bullet not even penetrating his surplice. The Humiliati were suppressed by Pope Pius V. in 1571.[1]

---

[1] *Tiraboschi*, Vetera Humiliator. monum. Mediol. 1766 sq., 3 T. 4to. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 235 sq.

§ 246. *The Three Great Military and Religious Orders.*

Tacitus informs us that among the early German tribes cavalry was the principal element of military power. During the centuries of feudalism, and especially during the age of the Carlovingians, the large feudal proprietors serving on horseback formed a separate and distinct class from the burghers. The Church employed every means at her disposal to put an end to the absurd conflicts between knight and knight and the barbarities of tournaments, and during the period of the Crusades succeeded in giving to chivalry a higher, a more humane, and a more noble direction. From this time forth those admitted to the order of knighthood had first to go through a severe course of military training, similar to that of a modern cavalry officer, and, having given proof of their *perfect skill in the use of arms*, were further required to have *a record of untarnished Christian conduct.* And in fact, after the beginning of the first crusade, such as had proved their skill and dexterity in the use of arms, and had led honorable and Christian lives until they reached man's estate, were assigned a higher place in their own order (*milites equites*) than they would otherwise have obtained, thus forming a sort of select body of men, before being admitted into which it was necessary to go through certain preliminary ceremonies and take a public and solemn oath. Inasmuch as the happy issue of the first crusade was attributed to the prudence and gallantry of the knights, they were thenceforth surrounded with the glorious prestige which an event of so vital importance would naturally give. The recital of their chivalrous deeds kindled in the breasts of those who had remained at home a desire to emulate their prowess, and occasioned those brilliant displays of chivalry which furnish so vast a scope to the imagination and so prolific a theme to the poet. What the Isthmian and Nemean games were of old to Greece, chivalry became now to the West. While the religious enthusiasm evoked by the Crusades continued to inspire the knights, their record was honorable and their lives virtuous and useful; but, once this enthusiasm had passed away, the glory of chivalry soon followed, or still existed only in the empty pageantry of rude and senseless combats.

---

[1] As a memorial of their white uniform, the Benedictine nuns who succeeded them in the monastery of St. Cecilia, in Rome, still wear a *white* habit. (Tr.)

The *military orders*, combining in their constitution the elements of *religious and military life*, added to their three monastic vows a fourth, by which they bound themselves to carry on a ceaseless warfare against the unbeliever. As the feudal system was founded on the right of primogeniture and entail, by which the eldest son and his direct descendants were the exclusive and sole heirs to the fief, the younger sons of a knight were forced to seek elsewhere a field for their energies, and in the order of knighthood found a position at once in keeping with their rank and sanctified by religion.

In the year 1048, certain merchants of Amalfi were permitted by the Caliph of Egypt to build a hospice in Jerusalem for the reception of pilgrims coming from Europe to visit the Holy Sepulchre, and by the side of it a church, which they placed under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. The hospice soon became too small for the increasing number of pilgrims, and a second was added. Those who first served in the hospice were called the *Hospitaler Brothers of St. John the Baptist.* When the Seljuk Turks succeeded the Egyptian and Arabian Saracens in Palestine, they plundered the hospice and cast Gerard, the first superior, into prison, where he remained until released by Godfrey de Bouillon, after the conquest of Jerusalem, in 1099. *Raymond of Puy*, the successor of Gerard, drew up a body of statutes for the order, by which he added to the original duties of *offering hospitality and serving the sick* that of fighting against the infidels and defending the Holy Sepulchre (A. D. 1118). By these statutes the Brothers were divided into three classes—*Knights, Chaplains, and Serving Brothers*—the last-named being fighting-squires, who attended the Knights in their expeditions. They were governed by a *Grand Master,* Commanders, and Chapters of Knights. The various hospices established in the maritime cities of Europe as resting-places for pilgrims were called *Commanderies.* The order was subsequently divided into eight languages—viz., Provence, Auvergne, France, Italy, Aragon, England, Germany, and Castile—each of which had a number of grand priories, and under these, again, were many commanderies. The order was approved by Pope Innocent II., who permitted them to wear on their breasts a *white cross of the Maltese form* (✠), and to have a red one emblazoned on their standards.[1] The Knights of St. John have always borne a reputation in every way worthy of their high calling.

---

[1] *Willelmus Tyr.*, Lib. I. 10; XVIII. 4 sq. *Jacob. de Vitriaco*, Hist. Hieros., c. 64; statuta ord. in *Holsten.*, T. II., p. 444 sq.; privilegia in *Mansi.*, T. XXI., p. 780 sq. (*Vertot*), Hist. des Cheval. hospital. de St. Jean., Par. 1726, 4 T., 4to;

On the conquest of Jerusalem, in 1187, the Hospitalers retired to Margat, in Phœnicia, whence they were driven by the advance of the Saracen arms, first to Acre, in 1285, thence to Limisso, in 1291, where Henry II., King of Cyprus, assigned them a residence. In 1310, the Knights, under the grand master, Foulkes de Villaret, assisted by a number of crusaders from Italy, captured Rhodes and seven adjacent islands from the Greek and Saracen pirates, and thence carried on a successful war against the infidels. In 1523, they were forced to surrender Rhodes to the sultan, Soliman, and retired first to the island of Candia, and afterward to Viterbo. In 1530, Charles V. assigned them the island of *Malta*, where, under the grand master, *La Valette*, they made a glorious defense against the sultan, Soliman, by whom they had seven years before been driven from Rhodes.

After the Reformation, the influence of the Hospitalers rapidly declined, and in 1798 they, under the grand master, D'Hompesch, surrendered Malta to the French. They still exist in Russia and Spain, but since 1801 only deputy grand masters have been appointed, who reside in the latter country.

At the very time when the Hospitalers took upon themselves the duty of combating the infidel, *Hugh de Payens* ("*magister militiae*"), Geoffrey de St. Omer, and seven other French knights added to their ordinary vows that of religion (A. D. 1118). Baldwin II., King of Jerusalem, gave them his own palace, situated on the site of the ancient Temple of Solomon, for a residence, and the abbot and canons of the church and convent of the Temple of Jerusalem added another building, whence the members of the order were called "Poor Soldiers of the Temple of Solomon," afterward abbreviated into *Templars*. But, owing to the small number of members, the order was in danger of becoming extinct before it had got fairly under headway. To prevent the failure of the enterprise, some of the knights passed over to France and

---

1761, 7 T. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 313 sq. *Gauger*, The Order of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, or the Maltese, according to unpublished and authentic documents, Carlsruhe, 1844. *Winterfeld*, Hist. of the Chivalric Order of St. John, Berlin, 1859. *Alfred von Reumont*, The Last Times of the Order of St. John (Suppl. of Ital. Hist., Vol. IV.)

presented themselves before the *Council of Troyes* (A. D. 1127), begging the ratification of the Rule that had been drawn up for their government. Thanks to the kind offices of *St. Bernard*, Pope Honorius II. assigned them the duty of defending pilgrims from the attacks of the brigands who infested the highways.

They were obliged by their Rule to attend daily the recitation of the office, or, if absent on military duty, to say a certain number of Our Fathers. They were to abstain from flesh four days in the week, and from eggs and milk on Fridays. Their habit was *a white mantle with a red cross* of eight points, of the Maltese form (✠), on the shoulder.[1] Aided by the ample donations which poured in upon them from every country of the West, they were enabled to render eminent services to the Church and to successfully combat the Turks and Saracens. Their war-cry was "Beau séant," and their banner, which bore the same name, was parted per fess sable and argent. Their badges were the *Agnus Dei* and a representation of two knights mounted on one horse, indicative of the original poverty of the order.

When Ptolemaïs had been wrested from the Christians (A. D. 1291), they established themselves in the island of *Cyprus*, and shortly after retired to Europe and settled on the immense estates which they had acquired in consequence of their members being, as a rule, drawn from the most distinguished representatives of the nobility. In every country of Europe where they existed, they had their governor, called the *Master of the Temple*, or of the Militia of the Temple. They had settlements in England from a very early period.[2]

Paris became the center of the order, where they resided in a magnificent and spacious palace, called "Le Temple," until their tragic end under Philip the Fair, in 1310.

---

[1] *Willelm. Tyr.* XII. 7. *Jac de Vitriaco.*, c. 65. *Bernardi*, tract. de nova militia s. adhortatio ad milit. Templi; regula in *Holsten.*, T. II., p. 429 sq.; in *Mansi.*. T. XXI., p. 305 sq. *Münter*, Statutes of the Order of Templars, Berlin, 1794, 1 vol. *Dupuy*, Hist. des Templiers, Paris, 1650; Brux. 1751, 4to. *D'Estival*, Hist. crit. et apolog. des cheval. du Temple, Paris, 1789, 2 vols. 4to. *Helyot*, Vol. VI., p. 25 sq. *Wilcke*, Hist. of the Templars, Lps. 1826–1834, 3 vols. *Addison*, History of the Knights Templars, London, 1842. As to the polemics which sprang up when this order was suppressed, see § 266.

[2] The first was in London, on the site of Southampton buildings, Holborn; but from 1185 their principal seat was in Fleet street, still known as the Tem-

Although the *Hospitaler Brothers* gave all possible attention to pilgrims, irrespective of their nationality, their good-will was frequently of little service, from the difficulty they found in making themselves understood; and this was particularly the case when they came in contact with Germans. To remedy this defect, a number of pious persons founded a *German* hospice, in 1128, and placed it under the direction of the grand master of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (A. D. 1143). But even this arrangement was found inefficient, as in many instances, and notably during the siege of Acre, the Germans were neglected. Touched with pity for their sufferings during this siege, certain merchants of Bremen and Lübeck extemporized a hospital by throwing up a few tents made out of the sails of their vessels, under which the sick and plague-stricken were temporarily sheltered and cared for. This was the humble beginning of the national hospice founded later on at Jerusalem, and to which the already existing branch was affiliated. The house was served by German hospitaler brothers. Such was the origin of the *Order of Teutonic Knights* of St. Mary of Jerusalem. *Henry of Walpot* was made their first grand master, in 1190. Only Germans of noble birth were admitted to membership, the founders having been probably ennobled before being enrolled. The members were at first all laymen, but priests were afterward admitted as chaplains. There were also added, about 1221, a class of half-brothers, similar to the serving brothers of the Templars and Hospitalers. The habit of the order was *a white mantle, with a black* (*fess*) *cross.*[1]

---

ple. The round church which bears their name was dedicated by Heraclius, Patriarch of the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, in 1135, and the chancel was consecrated in 1240. (Tr.)

[1] *Jac. de Vitriaco*, c. 66. *Hennig*, Statutes of the Teutonic Order, Koenigsberg, 1806. *Petri de Duisburg* (about 1236), Chronic. Pruss. sive Hist. Teut. Ord., ed. *Hartknoch*, Jenae, 1679, 4to. *Duelli* Hist. Ord. equit. Teut., Viennae, 1729 f. *Voigt*, Hist. of Prussia until the Fall of the Teutonic Order, Koenigsberg, 1827 sq., 9 vols. † *Watterich*, Establishment of the Teutonic Order, Lps. 1857.

So important were the services rendered by the order that it obtained the approval of *Celestine III.*, and received many marks of favor from Henry, King of Jerusalem, and from the clergy and nobility of his kingdom. After the capture of Damietta by the Crusaders, in 1219, to which the Teutonic knights materially contributed, large tracts of land in Prussia were given to the order, and the duty assigned them of protecting the Christians of those countries against the attacks of their pagan neighbors. To them do the cities of Thorn, Culm, Marienwerder, Rheden, Elbing, Koenigsberg (A. D. 1232–1255), and many others owe their origin.

After the fall of Acre, the first seat of the order, the grand master removed to Venice, and thence, in 1309, to *Marienburg*, on the Vistula. In the course of the thirteenth century the Knights conquered Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and other adjoining territories. Warriors from every quarter of Europe, in that and the following century, gathered under their standard, among whom were Henry IV. of England, accompanied by three hundred knights and men-at-arms. Their vast conquests, including the territory lying between the Oder and the Baltic, with a population of between two and three million, raised the order to the rank of a sovereign power. Its decline commenced in the fifteenth centnry, and its fall was hastened partly by internal discussions and partly by the attacks of neighboring states, particularly Poland and Lithuania.

Albert of Brandenburg, who was chosen grand master in the hope that he might reconquer the territories that had been taken from the order by Sigismund of Poland, ended an unsuccessful war against that prince by passing over to Protestantism and forming the territories of the order in East Prussia into a duchy, to be held by himself and his successors. Those of the Knights who remained faithful to the Church and to their order chose, *Mergentheim*, in Suabia, as their residence, and their grand master was recognized as a spiritual prince of the empire.

By the peace of Presburg (1805), the Emperor of Austria came into possession of the rights and revenues of the grand master, and when the order was abolished by Napoleon, in 1809, the lands belonging to it, lying in the several kingdoms of Europe, passed to their respective sovereigns. The order still continues to preserve a nominal existence in Austria.[1]

The *Brothers of the Sword* in Livonia (1202) were an order very similar to the Teutonic Knights, to whom they were affiliated in 1237. Belonging to the same class were the orders of St. Jago, Alcantara, and Calatrava, in Spain and Portugal.

§ 247. *Mendicant Orders—St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi.*

Vita St. Dominici, by his successors, *Jordanus* and *Humbertus*, the fifth general (*Bolland.* m. Aug., T. I., p. 358 sq.) Constitt. fratr. ordin. Praedicator., in *Holsten.*, T. IV., p. 10 sq. *Ripoli* et *Bremond*, Bullar. Ord., Praed. 1737 sq., 6 T. f. *Mamachii*, aliorumque ann. Ordin. Praed., Rom. 1754. *A. Touron*, la vie de saint Dominique de Guzman, etc., Paris, 1739. †* *Lacordaire*, les Ordres religieux et notre temps, Paris, 1839. The *same*, Vie de saint Dominique (Germ., Landshut, 1841; 2 ed. carefully revised, Ratisbon, 1871). *Caro*, Vie de saint Dominique (Germ., Ratisbon, 1854). *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 282-312. Vita St. Francisci, by *Thom. de Celano*, 1229, then complemented, in 1246, by *Leo Angelus* and *Ruffinus;* above all, by *Bonaventura* (Bolland. m. Octbr., T. II., p. 683 sq.) Opp. St. Franc., with several supplements, especially the Vita a Bonaventura ed. by *von der Burg*, Cologne, 1849. Regula in Holsten-Brockie, T. III. Cf. *Luc. Wadding*, Ann. Minor. until 1540, Lugd. 1625 sq.; 8 T. f. to 1564; Romae, 1731, 19 T. f. † *Vogt*, St. Francis of Assisi, Tübg. 1840. *E. Chavin de Malan*, Hist. de St. François d'Assisi (1182-1226), Paris, 1841 (Germ., Munich, 1842). *Daurignac*, St. Francis of Assisi (German by *Clarus*, Innsbruck, 1866). *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 249-282.

This period, so prolific in institutions of every sort, also gave birth to the Mendicant orders, a species of spiritual chivalry still more generous and heroic than that of which we have just treated, and unique in history. Their mission was a difficult one, but they accomplished it well. Many causes combined to call them into existence. In proportion as the Church grew wealthy her discipline relaxed, and dangers menaced her on every side; the shortcomings of the secular clergy were conspicuous and numerous, and the bulk of the people much preferred to their perfunctory services the ministrations of men animated by the apostolical spirit and leading the lives of ascetics; the Cathari, the Albigenses, the Waldenses, and such rigorists, counting upon the laxity of the secular clergy on the one hand, and the discontent of the laity on the other, were daily growing more dangerously aggressive in the assertion or their own claims; and, finally, the monks were now taking a greater share than heretofore in the education of youth and the care of souls. All these causes concurred to call forth a new order of men, who, while surpassing the sectaries in austerity, self-denial, and penitential exercises, removed by this very fact the objections of heretics, provided amply for the religious wants of the people, and constituted an organized and effective religious chivalry to resist the assaults of those enemies of the Church who could be met in no other way. When their effectiveness became apparent, directly monastic activity took a wider range, and, after the pattern of the military orders, included the functions of the monk and the priest. The problem thus presented to the Church was taken up at the opening of the thirteenth century, and thrown into practical shape by two men equally eminent in intellectual endowments and spiritual gifts. While each solved it in his own way, they were both attached to each other by the closest friendship.[1]

---

[1] Vide *Chambers*' Cyclopedia, art. Teut. Knights. We here state, on good authority, that the Archduke Maximilian, who died, a couple of years ago, at the age of eighty-four, seriously thought of applying the remaining revenues of the order to the founding of a bishopric at Troppau for Austrian Silesia. Negotiations were going forward in Rome, but William, the son and successor of the archduke, in the office of grand master, refused to surrender the property. (Tr.)

[2] *Pott*, De gladiferis s. fratribus milit. christ., Erlang. 1806.

Dominic, a member of the powerful house of *Guzman*, was born in the year 1170, at Callaruega (Calahorra, in Old Castile), a village in the diocese of Osma. While pursuing his studies in the university of Valencia, he was distinguished by a spirit of charity and self-sacrifice, and by his example exercised a salutary influence on those about him. After spending four years at this seat of learning, he was ordained priest by Diego, Bishop of Osma, and soon after admitted among the canons regular.

---

[1] As the legend runs, Dominic and Francis, while still unknown to each other, chanced to be in Rome at the same time. Dominic, while engaged in prayer one evening, had a vision, during which Christ appeared to him in the guise of an angry judge. Presently the Blessed Virgin presented to her Divine Son two men, who pleaded with Him to stay His justice and spare a degenerate world. One of these mediators he recognized as himself, but the other was unknown to him. Seeing Francis the next morning, in a church at prayer, Dominic at once recognized him as the person seen in the vision, and from this time forth the most tender friendship existed between them.

Dominic's mind was constantly occupied with projects for alleviating human misery. Diego, being a man of severe character, and ardently devoted to the good of the Church, found in Dominic one after his own heart. He took the young priest with him on a mission which he made to the south of France in the interest of his king, and, while there, the two saw and fully appreciated the danger to the Church from the sectaries, who were then spreading rapidly in that country, and both resolved to spend their energies in checking the advance of heresy. In 1203, they made a second journey to Southern France, and found there the Cistercian monks whom Pope Innocent III. had dispatched to convert the sectaries. Observing their pomp and magnificence, which contrasted strangely with the abstemious life and poverty of the heretical leaders, Diego stated in the council of Montpelier, convened to consider this affair, and to which he had been invited, that if they would successfully accomplish their mission, they must put aside all the state and circumstance of a *triumphant church*, and set about converting the heretics in the simplicity and poverty of apostles. His advice was followed; the missionaries put away everything inconsistent with poverty, traveled barefoot from place to place, and occupied themselves in preaching and disputing with the sects. Diego directed their movements, and, after laboring three years in this way, returned to Spain, and died on his journey homeward (1205 or 1206). He was thus prevented from carrying out a project he had much at heart—of organizing an efficient corps of missionaries to labor in this field; but his idea was taken up and realized by Dominic, whose experience, acquired during a long residence among the sectaries, gave him special qualifications for the work. When the Bishop of Osma was about to return to Spain, he placed the missionaries under the direction of Dominic. One by one they deserted their posts, and the faithful Spanish priest was left to labor almost single-handed. Undeterred, he went resolutely on in his work, hoping almost against hope. His peaceful disposition, his spirit of prayer, his charity, forbearance, and patient temper formed a consoling contrast to the *bloody crusade* which had recently been set on foot against the Albigenses. After spending ten years in this toilsome and thankless mission, laboring only for love of God and the profit of souls, he set out for Rome, in 1215, with his plans fully matured, and submitted to Pope Innocent III. the project of giving to the Church a new method of defense, in an Order which should combine the contemplative life of the monk with the active career of a secular priest. By a canon passed this very year, at the council of Lateran, the foundation of new orders had been prohibited; but, in view of the great want of preachers and pastors to supply the negligence of slothful and worldly priests, Innocent gave his sanction to Dominic's project, provided he would manage to bring it under some of the existing Rules. Dominic accordingly selected the Rule of St. Augustine, introducing a few changes, with a view to greater severity, taken from the Rule of the Premonstratensians. That the members of the new order might be free to devote themselves entirely to their spiritual labors, they were forbidden to accept any property requiring their active administration, but were permitted to receive the incomes of such as was administered by others. Property, therefore, might be held by the order as a body, but not administered by its members. Pope *Honorius III.* confirmed the action of his illustrious predecessor, and approved the Order in the following year, giving it, from its object, the name of the *Order of Friars Preachers* (*Ordo Praedicatorum*, *Fratres Praedicatores*). He also allowed the members to hear confessions and enter upon the care of souls wherever they might be.

After Dominic had transferred his residence from France to Rome, he was nominated, by the Pope, *Master of the Sacred Palace* (Magister Sacri Palatii) and chief of the staff of censors, and the office is to this day held by a member of the Order.

Dominic founded, in the year 1206, an order of Dominican *nuns*, who were first established at the convent of Our Lady of La Prouille, near Toulouse, and, after removing (1218) to the convent of San Sisto, in Rome, spread very rapidly. They followed the same *Rule* as the Friars, and were specially bound to habits of industry.

A *third* Dominican order, called the Knights of Christ, came into existence in 1224, and was approved in 1279. Its name was subsequently changed into that of the *Penitents of St. Dominic*, and its members were known as the *Tertiary Dominicans* (*Tertius ordo de militia Christi*). They took no vows, and lived pretty much as other people of the world, excepting that they kept certain fasts and performed certain devotions.

Corresponding to these, there were also female *Penitents of St. Dominic.* They were chiefly confined to Italy. Many of them became nuns, and their most illustrious representative is St. Catherine of Siena.

The chief object of the Dominicans was to preach the word of God, and thus secure the salvation of souls. Preaching and teaching were their special offices, but not to the entire exclusion of other duties.

A postulant was required to remain one year in the novitiate, after which nine years were to be given to the study of philosophy and theology, thus fitting himself to fill creditably the professor's chair in the university, or to occupy the Christian pulpit with profit to his hearers.

St. Dominic, meeting St. Francis one day, proposed to him to affiliate the two orders, to which the latter replied: "By the grace of God, many differences exist among various orders as to constitution, austerities, and other matters, to the end that each may serve as a pattern to the others and excite in them a desire to emulate and copy what is good in it; and if one be not content with us, he may go to you."

While Dominic was unsuccessful in his attempt to affiliate the two orders, he was nevertheless led to adopt the fundamental idea of St. Francis, and at a general chapter, held at Bologna, 1220, declared the members of his own community *Mendicant Friars.* The dress of the Dominicans is a *white* garment and scapular, resembling in form that of the Augustinians, with a black cloak and a pointed cap.

Francis of Assisi, the son of a wealthy merchant named Bernardini, was born in the year 1182, in Assisi, in Umbria. His baptismal name was John, but from his habit of reading the romances of the Troubadours in his youth, he gradually acquired the name of Il Francesco, or the Little Frenchman. Of a sprightly and vivacious temperament, he was gay and fond of display in his early life, indulging freely in pleasures, which, however, were never of a character to compromise his dignity or taint his honor as a Christian gentleman. His hand was ever open to the poor and the needy, and his bounty in this respect was so generous that it not unfrequently bordered on extravagance. He early took part in the exercises of chivalry, and engaged in the profession of arms. When about twenty-four years of age, he fell dangerously ill, and, while suffering from this attack, gave himself up to a train of religious thought which led him to consider the emptiness and uselessness of his past life and the weighty responsibility that would lie upon him for the future. He was for some time distracted, not knowing on precisely what object to spend his energies. He frequently had visions, but knew not whether to interpret them literally or in a spiritual sense. In one of these he beheld a vast armory, filled with all manner of weapons, over each of which was a cross, and on inquiring to whom they belonged, was answered: "To thee and thy soldiers." Taking the answer as a presentiment of future greatness, he was about to take military service with a certain count, when, after walking about in the fields one day, he stepped into a church rapidly going to ruin, where he heard a voice, saying: "Go rebuild my house, which, as you see, is fast falling to ruin." Taking the words in their literal sense, he went about collecting money to put this and other churches in repair, but he soon learned that the instruction referred to the spiritual and not to the material edifice.[1]

On one occasion, while assisting at Mass (A. D. 1208), he heard these words of our Lord read from the Gospel: "Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff;"[1] and, applying them to himself, cried out: "This is my sole wish, the one desire of my heart." Henceforth the most abject *poverty* was to him the most abundant *wealth.* He now conceived the idea of founding a society whose members should go about through the whole world, after the manner of the apostles, preaching and exhorting to penance. Francis was treated by his townsmen as an enthusiast and a madman, and, to escape his father's anger, retired to a cave, where he spent a month together in prayer and meditation, and came forth again, more determined than ever, to follow out the course upon which he had entered. After a time, the sympathy of the better classes went out to him, and his great sanctity, his supreme contempt of the world, his sincere humility, his undivided love of God, and his close following of the example of poverty set him by the Savior of the world, excited the admiration and commanded the respect of all. His zeal gradually excited emulation, and prompted others to aspire after the same perfection. His first associates were his townsmen, Bernard Quintavalle and Peter Cattano, and others soon followed. Their habit consisted of *a long brown tunic of coarse woolen cloth, surmounted by a hood of the same material, and confined about the waist with a hempen cord.* This simple but ennobling dress was selected because it was that of the poor peasants of the surrounding country.

---

[1] Licet principalior intentio verbi ad eam ferretur (ecclesiam), quam Christus sanguine suo acquisivit, sicut eum Spiritus Sanctus edocuit et ipse postmodum fratribus revelavit. *Bonaventura*, Vita St. Francisci, c. ii. (Tr.)

Through the recommendation of *Guido*, Bishop of Assisi, and Cardinal *John of St. Paul,* Francis obtained an audience of Pope Innocent III., to whom he submitted his Rule (A. D. 1210). "But," said the Pope, "where are you to get means to carry on this work?" "I put my trust in my Lord Jesus Christ," answered the saint. "He who promises glory and life eternal will not fail to provide the necessaries of the body here below." "Go, then, my dear son," replied the Pope, "and *in the measure* that God deigns to give you His light and strength, *do you* preach penance to all. If He be pleased to add to your numbers and to increase grace in your heart, send us word, and we shall then the more securely grant you fresh favors."

---

[1] Matt. x. 9, 10.

Apart from the characteristic prudence of Innocent III., he was slow to give his sanction to the foundation of a new order; first, because he had forbidden any increase of the existing number, and, secondly, because in that age every enthusiast thought himself called upon to set up a new community. Francis, prostrating himself, took the oath of obedience to the Holy Father. Still later on, he sent his companions, two and two, in all directions, saying to them in taking leave: "Go; always travel two and two. Pray until the third hour; then only may you speak. Let your speech be simple and humble, that it may bring him who hears it to praise and honor God. While announcing peace to all, be sure that it reigns in your own hearts. Never give way to hatred or anger, nor go aside from the path on which you have set out. You are called to lead back to the right road those who have gone astray, to heal the bruised, and to cheer the sorrowful. *Poverty* is the friend and bride of Christ, the root whence the tree draws life, the corner-stone of the temple, the queen of virtues. Should our brethren forsake it, then will our Order speedily go to pieces; but if they love it, if they remain faithful to it and give a pattern of it to the world, then will the world respect and support them."

With St. Francis, *absolute poverty* was not only a practice, it was the essential principle on which he based his Order. Not only were the individual members forbidden to have any personal property whatever, but neither could they hold any as an Order, and were *entirely dependent for their support upon alms*. And so rigorously was this rule enforced that even the clothes they wore, the cord with which they were girded, and the breviary out of which they said their office were regarded as common and not personal property.[1] Hence the chief difference between mendicant and other monastic orders consists in this, that, in the former, begging takes the place of the ordinary vow of personal poverty. In the other Orders, poverty was a passive, with the Franciscans an active principle. In a journey made by Francis to Spain, and in a voyage to Syria and Egypt, he followed out in practice what he taught in theory, begging his support along the way.

---

[1] *Milman's* Latin Christianity, Vol. IV., p. 264. (Tr.)

In 1223, Pope Honorius III. approved the Order of Franciscans (*Fratres Minores*), to which, as already stated, Innocent III. had given a verbal sanction in 1210, and the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215, whither, as Helyot informs us, St. Francis went to obtain the recognition of the Fathers. Pope Honorius gave them, at the same time, permission to preach and hear confessions anywhere in the Catholic world. But it was expected that they would preach not so much by *word of mouth* as by the *light of their example.*

When Francis made his voyage to Syria, he journeyed on to the *Holy Sepulchre,* where he left some of his brethren, who by consent of the sultan, before whom the saint preached, and with the approval of Clement VI. (A. D. 1342), have ever since remained *the faithful custodians* of that great *Catholic shrine.*

The gentle spirit pervading the Rule of St. Francis entitles it to a place among the most highly prized monuments of Christian ascetical literature. It prescribes that no one under the age of fifteen, or who has not passed a year in the novitiate, shall be admitted into the Order. It includes the three monastic vows of chastity, obedience, and poverty—the last requiring that the postulant shall not actually possess goods at the time of admission, and shall be incapacitated to possess them at any *future* time. It cautions the brethren against whatever may border on hypocrisy or a narrow-minded devotion, and exhorts them to be always cheerful, to rejoice in the Lord, to be ever ready to serve friends and enemies indiscriminately, to treat with equal kindness men of good and evil repute, and to make no distinction between the poor and the wealthy. Such, according to their founder, should be the character and conduct of Franciscans.

St. Clara of Assisi, the pupil and friend of St. Francis, had founded, in 1212, a female community, similar to the Order of Minorites. In 1224, Francis drew up a Rule[1] for them and superintended the direction of their convent of St. Damian, in Assisi. They were called, after their foundress, the *Order of St. Clara* (*Ordo Santae Clarae*), but went at first under the name of the Order of Poor Women (Ordo Dominarum Pauperum). They were also known as the *Second* Order of St. Francis. Although St. Francis was himself their spiritual director, he would never consent that any of his friars should serve this or any other convent of women.

---

[1] *Holstenius-Brockie,* T. III., p. 34 sq.; — the Rule of the Third Order, ibid., p. 39 sq.

There was also a *Third Order of St. Francis* (*Tertius Ordo de Poenitentia*, *Tertiarii*), established in 1221, comprising members who continued to live in the world, were not bound by the vows, and observed the spirit rather than the letter of the Rule. This gave an opportunity to many pious laymen, who could not sever family ties, to live a semi-religious life, and formed a link by which the Order was immediately connected with the outer world. These men were also called the *Tertiaries*.

Among the other great gifts of St. Francis was that of preaching. "His words," says St. Bonaventura, "penetrated, like glowing fire, to the inmost depths of the heart." Upon one occasion he was to preach before the Pope and cardinals, and had prepared a carefully written discourse. When he had ascended the pulpit, his memory played him false, and he was unable to go on. Frankly avowing what had happened, he dismissed all thoughts of his manuscript, invoked the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and his soul found utterance in words that went home to every heart, as St. Bonaventura says, like coals of glowing fire.

St. Francis, like all great souls, was a *sincere lover of nature.*[1] He looked upon it as a bond connecting his soul with all created things. He was wont to call the birds of the air and the beasts of the field his brothers and sisters. His hymns, which are among the earliest metrical specimens of the Italian language, are exceedingly simple, sometimes sublime, and always replete with the tenderest expressions of divine love. They are classed among the very best productions of Christian poetry.[2] His prose is often more poetical than his poetry, abounds in figures and personifications, and is written with ease and elegance.

---

[1] "Having," says *Goerres*, "subdued sin in himself, the consequences of original sin likewise disappeared. Nature even became his friend and obeyed the behests of his will. Between him and animals there was that confiding and frank intercourse which, as ancient traditions tell us, existed before the Fall." (*The Catholic.*)

[2] *Goerres*, Saint Francis, considered as a Troubadour. (The Catholic, 1826,

The Church of Sta-Maria degli Angeli, called "*Portiuncula*," or the Little Inheritance, given to the Franciscans by the Benedictine Abbot of Subiaco, in the restoration of which St. Francis labored with his own hands, became the central house of the Order. It was here that the General Chapter was held in 1219, ten years after the foundation, called the Chapter of Mats, because the multitude, being so numerous that no house could contain them, was provided for in booths scattered here and there in the fields. The chapter was attended by five thousand friars, who, of course, did not represent the full number of members, as many were obliged to stay away to look after the interests of the different houses at a distance. Before the Order had existed a half a century, it numbered thirty-three provinces, eight thousand convents, and close upon two hundred thousand members of every degree.

The Church of St. Mary of the Angels, or Portiuncula,[1] has always remained very dear to the Order. As has been said, St. Francis shared the labor of the workmen who set it to rights when it was going to ruin, and here he was accustomed to retire and give himself up to prayer and religious contemplation. To this church the Holy See, in 1223, granted the indulgences known as the "*Indulgences of the Portiuncula*," which, on being extended to all the churches of the Order, gave rise to a special feast, celebrated on August 2d. It was further granted to the faithful, for all coming time, to gain these indulgences whenever ("toties quoties") prepared to carry out the requisite conditions.

So intimate and intense was the sympathy of St. Francis with *the sufferings endured by the Savior while on earth*, that the latter appeared to him, under the form of a seraph, and imprinted upon his person the marks (*stigmata*) of the *Five*

---

nro. 4.) *Ibid.*, Transl. of his poems, by *Schlosser*, and, above all, the *Sun-rise.* The canticles in Germ. and Ital. (by Schlosser), Frankfort on the Main, 1842; 2 ed., Mentz, 1854; and *Schlosser*, The Church and her Hymns, 2 ed., Freiburg, 1863, Vol. II., pp. 360, 412. *Hase*, Francis of Assisi, Vol. VIII., p. 609 sq.

[1] Cf. *Freiburg Cyclopaed.*, Vol. VIII., p. 609 sq.

Wounds.[1] This was on September 17th, in the year 1224, two years previous to his death, and during this interval his soul was constantly on fire in an ecstasy of divine love, and his flesh the victim of a ceaseless martyrdom. The scene of the event is Monte Alverno, which has ever since been enshrined in the traditions of the Friars Minor.

When Francis felt the approach of death, he had himself carried on a bier to the church, where he was, by his own orders, laid on the bare ground and covered with an old habit, which the custos or guardian of the convent threw over him. While lying here he exhorted his brethren to love God, to cherish poverty, and practice patience, and closed by giving them his last blessing. He then had the Passion of our Lord according to St. John read to him, and, after reciting the one hundred and fortieth Psalm, yielded up his pure angelic soul to God, October 4, 1226. He was canonized in 1228 by Pope Gregory IX.

In 1304, Benedict XI. established the feast of Stigmata (*festum stigmatum Sancti Francisci*), and his successors—Sixtus IV., Sixtus V., and Paul V.—extended the celebration of it to the whole Church, on September 17th.

The leading events in the life of St. Francis have been transferred to mural paintings and canvas in the Church of the Portiuncula by some of the most celebrated artists.[2]

The constitutions of the two Mendicant Orders are substantially the same. The supreme government of each Order is vested in a *General* (*minister generalis, magister ordinis generalis*), who resides at Rome. Under him, again, is a Provincial, who presides over the brethren of a province; and, finally, among the Franciscans is a *Guardian* (*Custos*), who is at the head of a single convent; and among the Dominicans, the officer having similar duties to perform is called a *Prior.*

The supreme legislative authority of each Order is vested in the *General Chapter*, and in the *Provincial Chapter* for each province. These bodies each appoint four "*Definers*" (*Definitores*), whose office is to give counsel to and exercise a supervision over the Provincial or the General, as the case may be.

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1237, nro. 60. *Wadding*, ed. Rom., T. II., p. 429. *Görres*, Christian Mysticism, Vol. II., p. 240. **Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed.*, Vol. XII., p. 1158-1162.

[2] *Piccolomini*, Solemn Translation of the Relics of St. Francis of Assisi, Landshut, 1844, particularly p. 67-86.

Previously to his death, Dominic threatened severe imprecations against any one who should attempt to endow his Order.[1] He died August 4, 1221. The last words of this virginal patriarch to his spiritual children were: "Love one another, be humble, and never give up the practice of voluntary poverty." He was canonized by Gregory IX., July 12, 1234. The grateful Bolognese took a pride in adorning the tomb of the noble Guzman, and the most distinguished artists, from *Nicholas of Pisa* to Michael Angelo Buonanarotti, have paid the tribute of their genius to the worth and virtue of this great saint, and their splendid creations have largely contributed to immortalize both him and themselves. Even the austere *Dante* praised, in felicitous and vigorous verse, these two founders of the Mendicant Orders, representing them as the veritable heroes, the pride and glory of their century.[2]

§ 248. *Influence of the Mendicant Orders—Opposition Raised against Them.*

When the Mendicant Friars, strong in the special privileges accorded them, and still more so in the warm and living spirit of faith inherited from their holy founders, set about the work of gaining souls to Christ, it seemed as if the youth, the vigor, and the enthusiastic devotion of the early Church had been revived. They were everywhere received with universal respect.[3] Their *generals*, as was fitting, took up ther residence at *Rome*, and lent the influence of their Orders to the support of the Papacy. The greatest source of their power was the teaching office, which the Dominicans, in particular, were not slow to turn to good account. Early appreciating that the most efficient means of rising in public favor was to gain distinction in *scientific* pursuits and secure *professors' chairs in the universities*, the Dominicans applied for positions in the University of Paris, in 1230, and, through the good offices of the bishop and chancellor, obtained the chairs of theology heretofore occupied by secular priests. The first two who taught here were *Roland* and *John of St. Giles.*

---

[1] The Order received permission to accept endowments in 1245. (Tr.)

[2] "L'un (Francis) fu tutto serafico in ardore,
L'altro (Dominic) per sapienza in terra fue
Di cherubico luce uno splendore."
—*Dante, Parad., canto xi., v.* 38–40. (Tr.)

[3] *Matth. Par.* ad an. 1243 and 1246. Cf. Emm. Roderici nova coll. Privilegior. apost. Regular. mendicant., Antverp, 1623 f.

The Franciscans made similar applications, and their great theologian, *Alexander of Hales*, was also provided with a chair in the university.[1] In the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the members of the Mendicant Friars were in the foremost rank of theologians. *St. Thomas*, among the Dominicans, and *St. Bonaventure* and *Duns Scotus*, among the Franciscans († A. D. 1308), were the glory of their respective Orders and the light and strength of the Church.

The Dominicans were also distinguished by their love and cultivation of the fine arts, and the unprecedented zeal put forth by them in *missionary* labors. Members of their Order might be found in every country of Europe and in Asia and Africa. The first European vessel that touched the shores of *Greenland* brought a number of Friars preachers, and at the opening of the seventeenth century the Dutch were not a little surprised to find there the Dominican convent mentioned by Captain *Nicholas Hane* in 1280.

While purity of life, disinterested zeal, and single-minded earnestness were securing to the Mendicant Friars an almost exclusive control of spiritual affairs and opening a wide field for their eminent talents, they excited the envy and hostility of secular priests, who forfeited by neglecting the privileges they might have retained; of the old monastic orders, who saw themselves distanced by their younger brothers; and particularly of the arrogant men about the universities, who could not endure to see their influence and positions passing from them, and themselves outdone in their peculiar sphere by their more successful and industrious competitors. This opposition soon found expression in open and violent attacks upon the Friars; and, to make matters worse, the two Orders, while pursuing parallel lines of action, were often at variance with each other on points of scholastic theology and others of a trivial character.[1] Of all the assailants of the Mendicant Orders, *William of St. Amour*, who likened them to Pharisees,[2] was the most violent and dangerous. His attacks were repelled by *St. Thomas Aquinas* and *St. Bonaventure*, who made noble defenses of their respective Orders,[3] totally routing William. The Friars reaped the fruits of the victory gained by their champions.

---

[1] *Bulaei*, Hist. Univers. Parisiens., T. III., p. 838 sq., 244 sq.

§ 249. *Divisions among the Franciscans.*

When Francis was about to set out on his second voyage to Syria and Egypt, he intrusted the government of his Order to his vicar, *Elias of Cortona*, who, being little inclined to austerity, had already become the representative of a party desiring a mitigation of the Rule. Francis treated him with considerable *kindness*, thus preventing an open rupture. After the death of Francis, Elias was elected General, and successfully carried out his plans.

A second party, represented by *Anthony of Padua*, favored a strict adherence to primitive severity. Anthony appealed to Pope *Gregory IX.*, had Elias deposed, and, being himself appointed General, ruled the Order in the spirit of its founder.

The issue between the two parties turned upon the interpretation of the vow of *poverty*. The more rigid held that the members, neither individually nor as a community, should hold property, and that neither their estates, their monasteries, nor even their churches, should be held by them in fee-simple. In order to overcome this difficulty, a distinction was made between *right* of property and the *simple use* of it; and it was said the right might be vested in the Pope, while the members of the Order would enjoy its fruits. Anthony held that anything short of an absolute renunciation of the world was perilous. He died in 1231. There is a magnificent church erected to his memory in *Padua*, after the design of Niccolò of Pisa. In architectural beauty, it rivals the Church of St. Francis, at Assisi, and his tomb, in artistic decoration, that of St. Dominic, at Bologna. It is yearly visited by troops of pilgrims.

---

[1] *Matth. Paris.*, ad an. 1239, gives us an account of the animated discussion between the two Orders on the question of precedence.

[2] *Guilielmus*, de periculis novissimorum temporum, 1256 (Opp. Constant. 1632, 4to); better, the Paris edition, by J. Alethophilus (Cordesius). Cf. *Natal. Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. saec. XIII., c. 3, art. 7. *Richard Simon*, a rather slashing critic, calls William's book "a tissue of false and malicious torturing of the Scriptures against the Mendicant Orders.

[3] *S. Thomas*, Contra retrahentes a religionis ingressu; contra impugnantes Dei cultum (Opp. ed., Paris, T. XX.) — *Bonaventura*, lib. apolog. in eos, qui ordini Minor. adversantur; de paupertate Chr. ctr. Guil.; expositio in regulam fratrum minor. (Opp. Lugd. 1668, T. VII.) Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. III., p. 615 sq. Cf. Coll. cath. contra pericula imminentia ecclesiae per hypocritas etc. (*du Pin*, Bibl. des auteurs eccles., T. X.)

Meantime, the contest between the two parties went on. Elias was once more elected General, and again deposed. He died April 22, 1253.[1] So violent was the opposition of the rigorists that they broke completely with the Pope and allied themselves to his enemy, Frederic II. *St. Bonaventura*, while siding with those of the "stricter observance," shunned their excesses, and, by his prudent conduct and the influence of his great name, secured the triumph of his party for years after his death. Popes Innocent IV. and Nicholas III. approved his moderation; and the latter, by the bull "*Exiit qui seminat*,"[2] issued in 1277, put a milder interpretation upon the primitive Rule, substantially following the distinction given above. The defeated party, carried away by unseemly passion, assailed the Pontiff and the Roman Church, and, after the manner of the sects, contrasted the wealth and magnificence of the Church then with the poverty and simplicity of the apostolic age. They foretold that a new order of things would be presently inaugurated, and made special reference to the prophecy of the abbot *Joachim of Floris*, in Calabria († 1202), concerning the three ages of the world. The same idea was further developed by the two Franciscan rigorists, *Gerard*, in his "Introduction to the '*Everlasting Gospel*'" (c. a. d.

---

[1] *Roderici*, Collectio nova privilegior. apost. Regularium mendicantium et non mendicantium, Antverp, 1623, fol. p. 8 sq.

[2] Cf. *Wadding*, l. c., T. V., p. 73.

1254), and *Peter John Oliva* († 1297), both of whom said that the age of the *Holy Spirit* was to be established through the labors of St. Francis and his true disciples.[1]

The favor shown to the rigorists by Pope Celestine V., who affiliated them to the community of Celestines, put a period to the quarrel, but after his resignation it broke out afresh. Boniface VIII.[2] treated the incorrigible faction with considerable severity and dissolved their community (1302). A complete separation of the two parties was now effected, and each went under a distinct name. The less rigid called themselves "*Fratres de Communitate*," or *Conventuals*," while those of the stricter observance called themselves "*Observantists*," or "*Spiritualists*," and were styled by their opponents "*Zealots*" (*Zelatores*), and treated as sectaries.

§ 250. *Other Orders and Confraternities.*

In the year 1233, *Bonfiglio Monaldi*, by his powerful exhortations, prevailed upon a number of *Florentine* merchants to give up the world and dedicate themselves to a religious life. This they bound themselves to do, by solemn vow, on the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. Renouncing all earthly possessions, they retired to *Monte Senario* and embraced a mortified life. Here they built a church, and by the side of it a number of cells, where they dwelt and spent their time in performing devotions in honor of the sufferings of the Queen of Heaven, whence they were called Servites of the Blessed Virgin (*Servi B. M. V.*, *Servitae*). Their habit consisted of a black tunic, over which they wore a scapular. Alexander IV. confirmed the Order in 1255, and Martin V. was among its most generous benefactors. They also devoted themselves to the cultivation of science, and thereby secured a wide influence. Among their members were *Paolo Sarpi* († 1623), the intemperate historian of the Council of Trent, and the celebrated archeologist, *Ferrari*[3] († 1626).

---

[1] Cf. *Wadding*, l. c., T. V., pp. 314, 338.

[2] Ibid. ad an. 1302, nros. 7, 8; an. 1307, nro. 2 sq.

[3] Cf. *Pauli Florent.* Dialog. de orig. Ord. Serv. (*Lamii* Delic. eruditor., T. I.)

In the years 1244 and 1252, Innocent IV. brought together into one community all those persons who, scattered here and there in various countries, but notably in Italy, had been leading solitary and eremitical lives. This manner of life had been steadily increasing in popularity since the opening of the eleventh century. He commanded them to adopt the Rule of St. Augustine.[1] Thereupon, Alexander IV., acting on the suggestion of the superiors of all the Augustinian convents then holding a conference in Rome, placed the various congregations of Augustinians under one head.

Lanfranco Septala of Milan became the first General of the *Augustinian Hermits.* Subsequent Popes granted them many privileges, one of which was the office of papal sacristan, to be held perpetually. Pius V. named them the Fourth Order of Mendicants, the Carmelites being the third.

The prevailing tendency to interior life, and, in part also, the *false* pietistic notions of religious life, and, finally, the desire to provide for young females and widows left defenseless by the Crusades, inspired a number of pious ladies in the Netherlands and Germany, at the beginning of the twelfth century, to form associations for the double object of stimulating devotion and performing works of charity. The members of these associations did not take monastic vows, and led a life midway between the world and the cloister. Their cause was advanced chiefly by *Lambert le Begues*, a priest of Liége, who spent a considerable fortune in founding houses where virtuous widows and unprotected maidens might lead a religious life. According to one interpretation, they were called after him, Beguines, or *Beghines;* but, according to another, their name is derived from the Low German word *beghen*, signifying to beg or to pray. They devoted themselves chiefly to works of charity, served the sick, comforted the suffering, and led exemplary lives. But these houses, having neither constitution nor rule, soon became the centers of indiscreet zeal and fanaticism. They were often the objects of persecution, and eventually affiliated to the *Third Order of St. Francis.*

---

[1] Bullar. Rom., T. I., p. 100. Cf. *Bolland.* m. Febr., T. II., p. 744. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 379 sq.

By the side of these arose a third society, called the *Beghards*, composed of youths and adults.[1] They took Alexius for their patron-saint, and accordingly called themselves *Alexian Brothers*, but the designation was soon changed into that of *Lollhards*, signifying *those who sing in a low voice.* They were so named from their habit of chanting in low key and dolorous tone while carrying the dead to sepulture. They were industrious and pious, faithful in their attendance upon the sick and needy, assiduous and watchful in their care of the young, and much esteemed by nobles and princes. Unfortunately, like the Beguines, they fell into excesses, and adopted a sort of mystical pantheism, which issued finally in a downright heresy.[2]

TRUE PICTURE OF MONASTIC LIFE.

After having seen what the religious orders, obedient to the inspirations and graces of the Holy Spirit, undertook and accomplished, we shall read with feelings of respect and admiration a description of a well-ordered *monastery*, written by one who was himself a true *monk*, and, in endeavoring to ascertain his calling, observed closely the routine of cloister life and the habits of the monks. "I dwelt,"[3] says Guibert, Abbot of Gemblours, writing to Philip, Archbishop of Cologne, "I dwelt for eight months in the monastery of Marmoutiers (*Majus Monasterium*, or St. Martin's, near Tours). While there, I was treated not as a guest simply, but as a brother. In this abode of peace there is neither hatred, quarreling, nor ill-feeling. The wise observance of silence effectually prevents them. A simple look from the superior warns one of his duty. Those intrusted with offices are men of tried virtue. It would be difficult to find anywhere greater devotion in the recital of the Divine Office, a more profound veneration in the celebration of the Divine Mysteries, or a sweeter affability and a more watchful attention in serving guests. Fidelity, calmness, and an easy grace are everywhere visible; nothing is wanting, and yet nothing is superfluous. The strong help on the weak, inferiors are respectful to those above them, and superiors watchful and solicitous for the welfare of those in their charge. Here, indeed, do head and members constitute but one body. When an abbot is to be elected, the monks prepare to make a good choice by long and earnest prayer. The abbot-elect takes an oath to maintain inviolably the Rule of the house, and never to take a meal outside the common dining-room, or except at fixed hours. This provision contributes largely to the temporal prosperity of the monastery. Three poor men, representing Jesus Christ, take their meals daily beside the abbot. The present abbot combines prudence and humility, and has every qualification requisite to fit him to preside over so numerous a community. All are servants of Christ, and none takes account of his nobility of birth or the exalted position once filled by him in the world. The flesh is subdued and its humors corrected by vigils and fasting. One has a lion-like strength, and is not carried away by prosperous nor cast down by adverse fortune; another, borne up on the wings of grace, eagle-like soars heavenward, and all combine with the prudence of the serpent the simplicity of the dove. Everything that strikes the eye bears the tokens of consummate wisdom. Whether in church or in the workshop, everything is done orderly and at a fixed time, for these wonderful men never permit themselves to forget that the eye of God is constantly upon them. To nature is given only what is absolutely indispensable; the remaining time to the worship of God. One might call them an army, drilled and equipped and ready for battle, the clash of whose arms resounds from early dawn to the sixth hour. Files of monks may be seen prostrating themselves before the Altar. No sooner is one Mass over than another is begun. It were useless to attempt to compute the quantity of alms distributed at the monastery, or the number of souls saved from purgatory by the prayers of the monks. Their time is divided between reading and chanting. They break silence only on certain days, and then but for a short time, lest the strain of its perpetual observance should prove too severe a test, and speaking go on in private. Nothing is taken to eat outside either the refectory or infirmary. Guests are lodged and entertained in a separate building. While the meal is being taken, the monks are more intent to gain profit from the reading than upon what they are eating. The greater part of what has been served remains for the poor. The dormitory is constantly lighted, and the beds, which are in view of all, are hard and coarse. The lamp left burning through the night has also a mystical meaning, signifying that those there gathered together are to be children of light and not of darkness. Hence has our Savior showered upon them abundant blessings; for, besides their magnificent church and possessions of every sort, the monastery has two hundred cells, built outside its walls, dependent on it. The quantity of precious manuscripts one sees laid away on the shelves affords ample proof of the virtues that are here cultivated and flourish. These holy practices are in a large measure due to the counsels, the exhortations, and wise instructions given daily, but particularly on great festivals, by able preachers of the word of God, and contributing much to the profit and edification of all. I have heard them giving encouragement and comfort to each other, and keeping each other constantly in mind of the way to gain heaven. Had I not been obliged to return home, I should never have quit them, so great was the pleasure I experienced in being in their company. But, if I am far from them in body, my thoughts are ever with them."

---

[1] *Mosheim*, De Beghardis et Beguinabus, ed. Martini, Lps. 1790. *Hallmann*, History of the Origin of the Beguines and a clearing up of the confusion introduced into this subject through the falsification of documents (by Vilvorder), Berlin, 1848. See also *Tübg. Quart.* 1844, p. 504–513. *Bonn Periodical*, new series, Year IV., n. 4, p. 161 sq.

[2] Vide supra, § 238.

[3] Cf. *Hurter*, T. III., p. 599–601

Such is life in the cloister; now for a picture of the monk. The following one is drawn *from life:* "*Brother Robert*, of St. Marianus of Auxerre, was respectably well versed in the sciences, an eloquent preacher, and surpassed by none of his contemporaries in his knowledge of history. He was so completely at home in the Holy Scriptures, that he could quote the exact words of any part of them when occasion required. In this respect, his ability and erudition were simply a marvel. His countenance was calm and sweet, his manners gentle and amiable—fit expressions and tokens of his purity of soul. The straightforward honesty of his nature never permitted him to suspect dishonesty in others; always replying, when there was a temptation to do so, in the words of Seneca: 'Confidence alone makes others one's friends. Many, from fear of being imposed upon, teach others to deceive, thus creating evil by causing it to be suspected where it does not exist.' A sincere lover of justice, Robert hated iniquity, following in this the saying of the wise man: 'One can never sufficiently detest what is abominable.' On the other hand, he was always the friend of the sinner, how great soever his iniquity, and did his best to convert him to a better way of life, well knowing that mercy is characteristic of true and harshness of simulated virtue. To the penitent he was always compassionate and tender, and the unfortunate never appealed to him in vain. He strove to unite all hearts in the bonds of peace, and was severe on the *sewers of discord*, because, as the wise man saith, such are the abomination of the Lord. He was, morover, sincere in his speech, faithful to his promises, zealous for the service of God, temperate and economical, a prudent adviser and wise confessor. Of these many and excellent virtues, combined in one man, we should be especially zealous to appreciate and imitate his *humility* and his *chastity*, for while in the body, he lived as one out of it, and, dying, took his virginity with him to the grave."

But if, among all human institutions that have come into being in the course of ages, there has not been a single one perfectly answering our ideal of purity, nor even an ideal, saving a few solitary exceptions, that has ever been completely realized for any considerable length of time, why need it excite any surprise, if, out of so many thousands of monasteries, there have been found some forming a painful contrast to the beautiful picture just drawn?

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE.

§ 251. *Transformation of Cloister- and Cathedral-Schools into Universities.*

Meiner's Hist. of Superior Schools, Goettingen, 1802 sq., 4 vols. (but little satisfactory). Excellent historical research in *Savigny's* Hist of Roman (Civil) Law during the Middle Ages, Vol. III., p. 152–419, 2 ed. (the Universities); rectified on several points by *Buss*, Difference between the Catholic and Protestant Universities of Germany, Freiburg, 1846. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., p. 437 sq. (Science and Art.) *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 571 sq. *E. Dubarle*, Hist. de l'univ. depuis son origine jusqu' à nos jours, Vol. I., Paris, 1829. The art. "*Universities*," in the Freiburg Eccles. Cycloped. *Döllinger*, The Universities, once and now, Munich, 1867. *Newman*, On University Education.

Down to the age of Gregory VII., owing to the difficulties of the times, it had been found impossible to make any real progress in scientific studies in Germany. *Some* earnest efforts, at one time full of promise, were in the event barren of substantial results. By the end of the tenth century, the last traces of Charlemagne's genius, which had been gradually fading away, were wholly effaced. The great establishments devoted entirely to study began to rise only in the eleventh century. They speedily grew in favor, and so rapid was their development that the famous cloister-school of Bec, in Normandy, presided over by *Lanfranc* of Pavia, was thronged with eager pupils, and was regarded as a great seat of learning. So numerous were the pupils of *Anselm* of Canterbury († 1109), that they were compared to an army, and, later on, troops of young men followed *Abelard* into his desert retreat to listen to his lectures.

To Gregory VII., in a great measure, is due the credit of this reawakening of the human mind. The victory achieved by him was in reality the triumph of mind over matter, of freedom over tyranny, of law and order over violence and brute force. Thanks to the labors of monks, who, having preserved for centuries, now multiplied copies of the ancient classics, the facilities for prosecuting literary studies were more numerous and accessible than in any former age. In the cloister-schools and cathedral-schools, excellent masters were provided to impart gratuitous education to all comers, and forbidden to receive any compensation for their labor. So rapid was the advance of the intellect, and so great the demand for mental training, that schools of inferior note were soon transformed into *universities*,[1] without, however, at once embracing in their scope the full curriculum of scientific studies. Some taught more, some fewer branches, and each had its specialty. At *Salerno*, it was medicine; at *Bologna* (1200), jurisprudence, and at *Paris* (1206), canon law, dialectics, and theology.[2] *The mutual interdependence of the four leading branches of science*[3] was recognized and appreciated.

---

[1] Not at first in the sense of a *universitas literarum*, but as *corporations*, universitas doctorum et scholarium. These institutions were designated generally by the word "*schola;*" still later, by the term "*studium generale.*"

[2] In addition to these three universities, we have to count the following, which sprang up, one after another: 1. In *Italy*—Vicenza, 1204; Padua, 1222; Naples, 1224; Vercelli, 1228; Piacenza, 1246; Treviso, 1260; Ferrara (1264), 1391; Perugia, 1276; Rome, 1303; Pisa, 1343, and reëstablished in 1472; Pavia, 1361; Palermo, 1394; Turin, 1405; Cremona, 1413; Florence, 1438; Catanea, 1445. 2. In *France*—Montpellier (1180), 1289; Toulouse, 1228; Lyons, 1300; Cahors, 1332; Avignon, 1340; Angers, 1364; Aix, 1409; Caen, 1430 (1450); Bordeaux, 1441; Valence, 1452; Nantes, 1463; Bourges, 1465. 3. In *Portugal* and *Spain*—Salamanca, 1240; Lisbon (translated to Coimbra), 1290; Valladolid, 1346; Huesca, 1354; Valencia, 1410; Siguenza, 1471; Saragossa, 1474; Avila, 1482; Alcala, 1499 (1508); Seville, 1504. 4. In *England*—Oxford, 1249; Cambridge, 1257. 5. In *Scotland*—St. Andrews, 1412; Glasgow, 1454; Aberdeen, 1477. 6. In *Burgundy*—Dole, 1426. 7. In *Brabant*—Louvain, ——. 8. In *Germany*—Vienna, 1365; Heidelberg, 1386; Cologne, 1388; Erfurt, 1392; Ingolstadt, 1401; Würzburg, 1403; Leipsig, 1409; Rostock, 1419; Greifswalde, 1456; Freiburg, 1457 (opened April 26, 1460); Basle, 1460; Treves, 1472; Tübingen, 1456; Mentz, 1477; Wittenberg, 1502; Frankfort on the Oder, 1506. 9. In *Bohemia*—Prague, 1347. 10. In *Poland*—Cracow (1347), 1400. 11. In *Denmark*—Copenhagen. 12. In *Sweden*—Upsala, 1477. 13. In *Hungary*—Fünfkirchen, 1367; Ofen (Buda), 1465; Presburg, 1467. 14. In *Ireland*—Dublin, 1320 (1591, 1592).

[3] Cf. *Bonaventura*, reductio artium liberalium ad theologiam (German transl. in "The Cath. Magazine of Science and Practical Life," Vol. I. (Münster, 1845), p. 219–235. Cf. also **Staudenmaier*, On the Nature of Universities and the organic connection of the Sciences taught in Universities, Freiburg, 1839 (p. 22 sq. treats of St. Bonaventure's work, just quoted). *Hettinger*, The Organization of the Sciences taught in Universities, and the Places assigned there to

A beautiful tradition represented as brothers the three great masters of that age—viz., *Peter Lombard*, the renowned theologian; the great canonist, *Gratian*, and *Peter Comestor*, the author of the popular "*Historia Scholastica.*" An analogy was instituted between the four professional sciences and the body and soul of man. The center around which they all moved, and toward which they all gravitated, was the *Divine Logos*, the Word begotten from the beginning, the source and *medium of all knowledge.*[1] It was in this sense that theology was called the queen of sciences. The *method* pursued in *theology* was, aside from the use of the books of the Old and New Testament, to read and explain passages from the writings of the Fathers bearing on the particular dogma in hand. In *jurisprudence*, the Pandects were used; in *medicine*, Hippocrates and Galenus; and in *philosophy*, Aristotle, or the *Isagoge* of Porphyrius. These were taken up, explained, and commented on. After the twelfth century, the commentaries took the form of the so-called *Summae*, of which there are examples in the various branches of science. Thus, in theology, there are the *Libri IV. sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, and the *Summa Thomae Aquinatis;* in canon law, the *Decretum Gratiani;* in medicine, the *Regula Salernitana* and *Summa Thaddaei;* and in jurisprudence, the *Summa Azonis*, which were all used as hand-books of their several subjects, and commented on in the universities by eminent professors.

A precise knowledge of the studies then pursued at the universities, and of the progress made during this period, may be gained from the writings of *Vincent of Beauvais*, *Albertus Magnus*, and *Roger Bacon.*

All the university *constitutions* were modeled after those of *Paris* and *Bologna.* The constitution of the University of Paris was *monarchical* and *aristocratic* (schola *magistorum*); that of Bologna, more or less *democratic* (universitas *scholarium*). The students were divided into *nations*, each pre-

---

Theology, Würzburg, 1865, pp. 51, 52. In effect, the ancient Greeks and Romans already acknowledged a certain connection of all the sciences: "Est illa Platonis vera vox, omnem doctrinam harum ingenuarum et humanarum artium uno quodam societatis vinculo contineri." (*Cicero*, De Oratore III. 8.)

[1] John i. 4, 5.

sided over by a *procurator* (consiliarii or procuratores nationum), elected by the *deans*. These, again, presided over subdivisions of the students, according to provinces or dioceses. The procurators chose the *Rector*. Universities were *ecclesiastical in their origin*, and, as a rule, grew out of ecclesiastical foundations. Hence their charters of foundation were granted by popes and emperors (*cum privilegiis pontificiis et caesareis*). The former have, in every age, encouraged the founding of universities, and done their utmost to increase their number.

"The pearl of knowledge," said Popes Calixtus III. and Pius II., "makes man like to God, leads him to investigate the secrets of nature, is an aid to the high-born, and raises one of humble birth to places of honor and distinction. While everything else decreases by being distributed, knowledge gains strength in proportion as it is diffused." Hence, institutions of learning received then, as in every age, special care and exceptional privileges from popes. They provided them with chancellors, and, in order that the clergy might be able to frequent their schools, released the latter from the obligation of residence and appointed them to benefices. Innocent III. prescribed that the University of Paris should have eight professors of theology, each of whom was required to have spent eight years in the study of the other sciences, and five years in the study of theology, before taking his chair. The inhabitants of university cities were inhibited by papal censures to demand extortionate prices, and, on the other hand, the perpetuity of the universities was guaranteed to the cities.

To still further promote study, *colleges* or *halls* and *burses* or *convictoria* were founded, in connection with the university, for the double purpose of providing poor scholars with the means of support, thus enabling them to prosecute their studies without anxiety, and of keeping a watch over their moral conduct and religious training.[1] One of the oldest of the sixty-three colleges attached to the University of Paris was that founded in 1250 by *Robert of Sorbonne*, aulic chaplain to St. Louis. It was especially intended for students of theology (*ad commune hospitium pauperum scholarium et magistorum in theologia*), and hence the theological faculty of the university was afterward called "*The Sorbonne.*"

---

[1] Quod omnis labor universitatis in cassum abeat, nisi provideatur collegio bursae, ut ibidem tam pietas quam eruditio plantetur (Protocolla senatus Universit. Freiburg., T. VII., p. 194).

To show the great consideration in which these seats of learning were held in those days, it is sufficient to state that they were consulted in every important *affair of Church and State*, and that their judgment was generally accepted as decisive, as is shown by the action of the synod of Gerstungen (1085), and the weight attached to the proceedings of the professors who met on the plain of Roncaglia.[1]

§ 252. *Scholasticism and Mysticism.*

Staudenmaier, John Scotus Erigena, Vol. I., p. 366–482. *Moehler*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 129 sq. *Bossuet-Cramer*, Pts. V.–VII. *Ritter*, Hist. of *Christian* Philosophy, Vol. III. *Hauréau*, De la philosophie scholastique, Paris, 1850, 2 vols. *Kaulich*, Hist. of Scholast. Philos., Prague, 1862, Vol. I. *Stöckl*, Hist. of the Philos. of the Middle Ages, Vols. I., II. **Ueberweg*, Hist. of the Ages of the Fathers and of the Schoolmen, 3 ed., Berlin, 1868. †**Mattes*, the articles "*Mysticism*" and "*Scholasticism*," in the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed.*, Vols. VII., IX. (French transl., Vol. XV., p. 458, and Vol. XXI., p. 328.) *Kleutgen*, Philos. of Past Ages. For a knowledge of scholastic *Terminology*, see *Zamae Melinii* lexicon, quo veterum theologorum locutiones explicantur, ed. nova, Colon. 1855; and Lexicon Peripateticum, ed. 4to, Bononiae, 1856. (Tr.) — **J. J. Goerres*, Christian Mysticism, Ratisbon, 1836 sq., 4 vols. *Schmidt*, The Mysticism of the Middle Ages at the Epoch of its Origination, Jena, 1824. *Helfferich*, Christian Mysticism in its Development and Monuments, Hamburg, 1842, 2 vols. Cf. *Theol. Review* of Freiburg, Vol. IX., p. 254 sq. *Noack*, Christian Mysticism, Koenigsberg, 1853, 2 pts. *Neander*, Ch. Hist., Vol. V., p. 472–710. Torrey's transl. of the same, Vol. IV., p. 411 sq. — Besides the works on the history of Christian literature, by *du Pin*, *Ceillier*, *Oudinus*, *Cave*, and *Busse*.

Christian life among the Germanic nations, whether regarded in its internal growth or external development, began with Charlemagne. The tide of immigration had indeed ceased, but not until every trace of Roman civilization had been submerged. When danger was no longer to be apprehended from foreign enemies, the people began to cultivate the peaceful arts and to enter upon intellectual pursuits. Having no Pagan models to copy, they were left to follow their own genius and the peculiar bias of their national characteristics, except in so far as their minds had been influenced by *ancient Christian traditions.* The mental productions of these people, therefore, were at once *Germanic* and *Christian*, and issued eventually in *Scholasticism* and *Mysticism*, the seeds of which had long since been sown.[1] Thus, while the intellectual efforts of the Germans had all a common origin, they manifested themselves under two different and distinct aspects—the one *speculative* and the other *contemplative.* A *clear* apprehension of truths was the characteristic of the former; their *intense contemplation*, of the latter. Scholasticism, therefore, is the speculative *theology of the Germans.*[2] Based upon the teachings of the Church, it employs the methods of philosophy to throw those same *teachings into scientific shape*, and, after the manner of Origen, to create a *system* of Christian philosophy. It is but a repetition, under changed circumstances, of the tendency prevalent during the first centuries of the Church's history. Hence the orthodox scholastics, following the traditions of the Alexandrian school and the teachings of St. Augustine, adopted as their rule the following principle: "*Faith precedes science, fixes its boundaries, and prescribes its conditions.*"[3]

---

[1] See above, pp. 508, 552.

---

[1] See above, p. 173.

[2] The appellations *Scholastic* and *Scholasticism* are etymologically the same, as the word *scholasticus*, which was applied to the head master of cathedral and cloister schools, and hence the studies there pursued were called, generally, *scholastica.* The two appellations were retained during the Middle Ages, with this single modification: "*Theologia scholastica*" meant *speculative* theology, or theology scientifically demonstrated, while *theologia positiva* meant no more than a simple statement or exposition of the traditional teaching of the Church. (A *scholasticus* was originally a teacher of rhetoric in the public schools of the Roman Empire.—Tr.)

[3] *Guitmund*, scholar of Lanfranc's, and subsequently archbishop of Aversa, says: "Non enim praecepit tibi Christus: *Intellige*, sed crede. Ejus est curare, quomodo id, quod fieri vult, fiat: tuum est autem non discutere, sed humiliter credere, quia quidquid omnino fieri vult, fiat. *Non enim intelligendum prius est, ut postmodum credas, sed prius credendum, ut postmodum intelligas.* Nec Propheta Jesaias vii. 9, dixit: nisi intellexeritis, non credetis, sed nisi credideritis, non intelligetis." (De corp. et sang. in Max. bibl., T. XVIII., pp. 445, 446.) Just so says *Anselm* in his new formula, credo, ut intelligam, as we shall see further down, § 253. The same assertion is made by *Alexander of Hales:* "In logicis *ratio* creat fidem, in theologicis *fides* creat rationem, *fides est lumen animarum:* quo quanto magis quis illustratur, tanto magis est perspicax ad inveniendam

In contradistinction to the speculativeness of the *Fathers* of the Church, Scholasticism has the following characteristics: 1. Being exclusively confined to the domain of *theology*, it starts with the principle, not only that the idea of God is the basis of every other branch of knowledge, but that all other sciences are subservient to it and dependent on it. 2. Being the direct exponent of the positive teaching of the Church, it includes within its scope, besides theological questions in the strict and limited sense, every other department of human science, not excluding the fundamental principles of philosophy, the sources of knowledge, and the limits of human reason and its relation to the phenomena of nature. The history of the controversy on Realism and Nominalism is an example of this statement. 3. The *dialectical* method, and particularly the syllogistic form, are more prominent in the treatment of dogmatic truths, thus manifesting a tendency to throw the whole deposit of faith into a scientific *system*. This *last* characteristic of Scholasticism will also help us to understand, on the one hand, why the *philosophical* writings of the greatest schoolmen—as, for instance, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and others—were no more than *commentaries on Aristotle*, the founder of the dialectic system; and, on the other, why such schoolmen as Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bonaventure became the representatives of *two* different methods of treating the dogmas of the Church.

Much has been said, by various critics, of the influence exercised by the writings of Aristotle and Plato on Scholasticism,[1]

---

rationem." St. Thomas Aquinas reasons in the same manner, de veritate cath. fidei ctr. gentes, Lib. I., c. 7, whose heading runs thus: "Quod veritati fidei christ. non contrariatur veritas rationis;" and after this, it is said: "Quamvis autem praedicta veritas fidei christianae humanae rationis capacitatem excedat, haec tamen, quae ratio naturaliter indita habet, huic veritati contraria esse non possunt.

[1] In his history of Christian philosophy, Vol. III., p. 91 sq., *Ritter* expresses himself in the following terms: "*Tennemann* (Hist. of Philos., Vol. VIII., p. 705) has shown how many erroneous ideas have been spread on this subject." "A striking proof of the above assertion," he says, "is found in the doctrine that God created all things out of nothing—a doctrine which St. Thomas and Duns Scotus fancied they had found in Aristotle." "One would be tempted to ask himself seriously whether Tennemann had ever read these two authors. The

but from the above statements we may conclude that this influence was confined substantially to modes of thought and *logical processes* of reasoning borrowed from these great philosophers because of their special adaptability to the exposition of Catholic truth. In transferring these old methods into a new system, Christian writers were careful to emphatically reject the errors of both Plato and Aristotle. For example, Albertus Magnus confuted the Aristotlian dualism and coëternity of God and matter, and the Aristotlian tenet that the faculty of understanding, the "active intellect" ("νοῦς ποιητικός," "*intellectus agens*"), is one and the same in all men—an intellectual substance existing apart from man, and independent of him.[1]

Of course no systematic studies in speculative science or Scholasticism could be undertaken by the Germans until the period included between the sixth and eighth centuries, when the works of Greek philosophers, and particularly of those who flourished during the age of the Fathers, had been *collected* and rendered accessible through synoptical tables of their most important subjects, compiled by churchmen like Boëthius, Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, Tajus of Saragossa, Ildephonse of Toledo, Venerable Bede, and John Damascene, or, in any complete sense, until the ninth and eleventh centuries, during the controversies on Adoptionism, Predestination, and the Eucharist, when many *special questions* in both theology and philosophy were deeply studied and ably discussed by eminent scholars like Alcuin, Gottschalk, Paschasius Radbertus, and Berengarius, not to speak of the host of

---

same may be said of *Braniss* on whatever he advances concerning the process of the development of philosophy in ancient times and during the Middle Ages (Breslau, 1842, p. 400), and *concerning the influence of Aristotle* on the philosophy of the Middle Ages, and concerning rightly appreciating or misunderstanding Aristotle." Cf. especially †*Clemens*, De scholasticorum sententia, *philosophiam esse theologiae ancillam*, commentatio, Monasterii, 1856.

[1] Themistius and Thomas Aquinas, in a former age, and Trendlenburg, Brandis, and others, in our own, have shown that Aristotle did not hold the νοῦς ποιητικός to be an intellectual substance, or the Deity, or some other superhuman intelligence existing apart from man, and independent of him, as the text would imply. See the Psychology of Aristotle, and especially his doctrine on the ΝΟΥΣ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ, p. 165-168, by *Francis Brentano*, Mentz, 1867. (Tr.)

minor celebrities ranged on either side. Toward the close of the eleventh century, all these isolated efforts were combined and took shape, consistency, and aim under *Anselm* of Canterbury, with whom *the first period* of Scholasticism opens, and closes with *Peter Lombard* († 1164) and *Hugh of St. Victor* (1142). In this interval many of the doctrines and definitions of the Church were arranged into *groups*, demonstrated speculatively, and, in a measure, *methodically*. During the *second* period, which includes the thirteenth century, and was the most flourishing age of Scholasticism, the most distinguished ornaments of the schools were Dominicans and Franciscans. These were Alexander of Hales, the "Irrefragable Doctor;" Albertus Magnus, the "Universal Doctor;" Thomas Aquinas, the "Angelic;" Bonaventure, "the "Seraphic," and Duns Scotus, the "Subtle." During this period, Aristotle was more deeply studied and more fully understood than heretofore, thus leading the way to the preëminence in dialectical skill and fondness for method and system which so distinguished the schoolmen. During the *third* period, embracing the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the revival of Greek and Roman classical literature was fascinating all minds and being carried to excess, Scholasticism declined and partially retreated from the field it had so long occupied, to give place to the *Humanists*.

The representative men of every age have respected the schoolmen as the leaders in a great intellectual movement, and the world is coming *at last* to judge them with something like fairness. Only the prejudiced and those to whom thought is laborious, and by whom speculation is regarded as dangerous, have presumed to deny to Scholasticism its great scientific importance. Quite different has been the judgment of Bossuet, Leibnitz, Hegel, and all great thinkers, whether within or without the Church. Many features of Scholasticism were severely criticised at an early day; and, while one would not wish to see it restored in its original form, he can not help but regret that its principles, its accurate methods of thought, its loyalty to truth, its culture and learning, its chivalric enthusiasm, and its dauntless courage, have not now their hold on men's minds, and are not now as popular as then.

What has been said of Scholasticism may be applied with equal truth to the *Mysticism*[1] of the Middle Ages. Christian Mysticism was based chiefly on the Gospel of *St. John*,[2] supplemented by the writings of *Didymus*, and *Macarius the Elder*, and particularly by those of *Denys the Areopagite*.[3]

Like the *Neo*-Platonists, the mystics held that to arrive at a *practical, holy, and intimate union with God*, self-denial and mortification of the senses are necessary. Besides corporeal austerities and the shutting out of external objects of sense from the mind, the next step to this union is the practice of *contemplation or consideration*. Once Mysticism had reached the dignity of *a science*, it employed the same dialectical methods in use among the schoolmen.

It is well here to draw attention to a distinction between Christian Mysticism and Neo-Platonism, which, though frequently overlooked, is absolutely essential to a correct understanding of either. The former, starting from the fact of original sin, seeks always to restore the likeness of God in the soul and its union with its Maker; while the latter, ignoring original sin and regarding the soul as a portion of the divine nature, professes to endeavor to free it from the trammels of the body and have it again absorbed in the Godhead. Hence, while the principles of the one are thoroughly orthodox, those of the other are the rankest sort of Pantheism.

Scholasticism is to Mysticism what science is to practical life. The former asks the question, What is *the true?* and directly sets about a discussion of theoretical principles; the latter puts the question, What is *the good?* and straightway attempts to carry out in practical life the teachings and promptings of faith, and to effect *a union with God.*

---

[1] "*Mysticism*" is derived from *μύειν*, to shut in, to shut the eyes as a sign of interior life.

[2] *Neander*, History of the Establishment and Government of the Church by the Apostles, 1 ed., Vol. I., p. 670, says: "*St. John* was less inclined to draw out his ideas *in full* than *St. Paul*, who was a dialectician, and had been brought up in the school of Gamaliel. In St. John the *intuitive* element predominates. He is distinguished by the great ideas to which interior life and habits of contemplation give birth, rather than by a rational tendency to look into details." And again, p. 699: "In as far as that tendency of the Christian mind which, in opposing cold rationalism and sectarianism, issued in *Mysticism*, is true, St. John is its representative."

[3] See Vol. I., p. 567, and Vol. II., p. 173.

Apart from the various divergencies of opinion on minor points, as to the best method of reaching this intimate union, all mystical writers and masters in the spiritual life are agreed that *three* stages are essential—viz., *purification*, or the freeing of the soul, by ascetical practices, from the shackles of sense; *illumination*, or the interior and spiritual life, which the soul, once set free from the trammels of the body, and rising superior to the influence of the world, is able to lead; and *perfection*, or *union with God*, in which the soul becomes completely absorbed in thoughts on God and witnesses this near approach to the Divinity by outward manifestations, as ecstasies, miracles, prophecies, and the like.

Again, while Scholasticism is chiefly occupied in scientific pursuits, the gift of preaching is the characteristic of Mysticism. Hence, all mystics, from St. Bernard to Thomas à Kempis, have been distinguished either as pulpit orators or *spiritual* writers. *Gerson*, being not less acquainted with Scholasticism than Mysticism, was quite competent to pass judgment on their scope and relations to each other. "In Scholasticism," he says, "intellect is predominant, and is concerned about truth (*potentia intellectus circa verum*); in Mysticism, the affections are more prominent, and embrace what is good (*potentia affectuum circa bonum*)." The same thought is expressed by *Thomas à Kempis* in the "*Following of Christ:*" "*I had rather feel compunction*," he says, "*than understand the definition thereof.*"

Scholasticism was always regarded as superior in rank to Mysticism, their relations to each other being expressed by comparing the former to the sun and the latter to the moon. The contrast presented in the character and scope of these two phases of mental development was but the necessary outgrowth of the tendencies of the age. To Mysticism is to be attributed the grand movement of the Crusades. To it do we owe Gothic architecture and similar creations. It has taken shape and form in the venerable old Gothic churches. Are they not an expression of that deep and pervading sentiment of the human soul which struggles with a holy and yearning enthusiasm to mount up to the throne of the Most High? "The same spirit breathes in the pointed cathedral arch and in the pages of the '*Following of Christ.*' But it required Scholasticism to preserve the equilibrium of Mysticism, which, from its very nature, was in danger of being carried to excess. Making little account of anything but practical life, it not unfrequently mistook the true character of science, and lapsed into error more easily and more frequently than did Scholasticism. The latter, for analogous reasons, was equally in need of the presence and influence of Mysticism; for, from the very outset of its history, it manifested a tendency to estrange itself from active life. It has also left its impress on Gothic architecture, for what are those mighty minsters set upon immovable foundations and sustained by solid pillars, their graceful columns and bold arches rising away into the space above, and losing themselves at last in endless ramifications and countless figures, almost imperceptible to the eye, yet executed with the most conscientious accuracy and delicacy, but the image of the *Scholastic system?* Like those noble old cathedrals, it, too, is set upon the solid foundation of the Scriptures, is sustained by the authority of the Fathers, employs in its development all the resources of a bold and acute reason, which, rising to the higher regions of thought, is lost amid the detail of theses and antitheses, terms and syllogisms, distinctions and conclusions, questions and answers, sections and articles, all displaying a rich luxuriance of intellect and a precision of finish, but, to the unpracticed eye, looking like a hopelessly entangled mass. Both the theologian and the architect—the former employing signs, the latter symbols—in raising a great and faultless work to the honor and glory of God, must be equally conversant with the rules of art and the principles of *science;* and, to make the analogy complete, neither loses sight of the Pagan element. Countless fantastic figures mark its presence in architecture, and in Scholasticism it is manifest in the ideas borrowed from one *Pagan philosopher*, and in the dialectical methods imported from the other."[1] Hence, the true theologian combines depth of feeling with clearness of conception and accuracy of thought. Such are, in matter of fact, the characteristics of the great minds of the Middle Ages, in whom Scholasticism and Mysticism were, so to speak, in equilibrium, and who are represented by men like *St. Bernard* and *St. Thomas Aquinas*, but still more decidedly by *Hugh of St. Victor* and *St. Bonaventure.*

---

[1] *Staudenmaier*, Christian Dogmatics, Freiburg, 1844, Vol. I., p. 235.

§ 253. *St. Anselm of Canterbury.*

Bolland., Acta SS. mens. April, T. II., p. 866. *Moehler*, Complete works, Vol. I., p. 32–176. *De Remusat*, Anselm of Canterbury, Germ. transl. by *Wurzbach*, Ratisbon, 1854. *Hasse*, Anselm of Canterbury, Lps. 1844 sq., 2 pts. * *Stöckl*, Hist. of the Philos. of the Middle Ages, Vol. I., p. 151–208. *Ribbek*, Anselmi doctrina de Spiritu sancto, Berol. 1838. *Ueberweg*, l. c., 3 ed., p. 124 sq.

Anselm of Canterbury was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, in 1033. Attracted by the reputation of *Lanfranc*, he went to study at the abbey of *Bec*, in Normandy, in 1060. Three years later he became prior, and, in 1078, abbot of this monastery, the most celebrated school of the eleventh century. Lanfranc, who had in the meantime become Archbishop of *Canterbury*, died in 1089, and, four years later (1093), Anselm was appointed his successor. He died in 1109.

Anselm was equally distinguished as a churchman and a scholar. His energy of character and strength of will are manifest in his contest with William Rufus and Henry I. on investitures, and his writings are ample evidence of his ripe scholarship and dialectical skill. He may be regarded as the father of Scholasticism. He was a close student of the writings of *St. Augustine*, and, after the Holy Scriptures, looked to them for a solution of the difficulties that met him in his investigations.[1] His fundamental principles may be summed up as follows: "Man is created in the image of God, but this image is only in outline, and must be filled up before one can arrive at a knowledge of himself. But for this work, man, being a dependent being, requires some external motive to spur him on. Such is *revelation* which is accepted on faith. Faith, he said, precedes *science*, and gives birth to it; and hence the title of one of his works: "*Fides quaerens Intellectum.*" And his very first work is called "*Monologium sive Exemplum Meditandi de Ratione Fidei.*" He is a votary of Truth, and, in speaking of it, does so with a religious reverence. But, while devotedly loyal to faith, Anselm is not unmindful of the claims of reason. Hence he holds it to be a sacred duty *to reduce the truths of faith to scientific form*, the neglect of which would expose Christians to the opprobrium of being inferior to the Pagans.[1] Accordingly, he set to work to demonstrate *the attributes of God* and of the *Three Divine Persons*, by a method at once dialectical and speculative. Starting out to prove *the existence of God*, and finding that the usual arguments, drawn from the marks of design and the endless variety, order, and gradation of everything in the universe—thence concluding that there must be a self-existent cause of all this, one supreme and infinitely perfect God—were insufficient for his purpose, he professed in his "*Proslogium*," or "*Fides quaerens Intellectum*," a later work, to put forward a demonstration so convincing as to dispense with every other. This is *ontological* in character, and concludes the existence of God from the fact that the human mind has an idea of a *Being infinitely supreme, than which no higher can be conceived of.* Even the atheist, while denying the objective existence of God, must admit that he has a mental conception of such a Being. Now, continues St. Anselm, inasmuch as it is impossible to conceive of this Being at all without conceiving of Him as existing, it follows that the idea of Him does not alone exist in the mind (*in intellectu*), but has an objective reality also (*in re*). Hence it is further concluded that whatever there is in the world of the *beautiful*, the *good*, and the *true*, is but a reflection of Him who is all beauty, goodness, and truth.

---

[1] His writings are: Monologium (de divinitatis essentia); proslogium (de existentia Dei, Brixiae, 1854); cur Deus homo (ed. *Laemmer*, Erlang. 1858); de fide Trinit. et de incarnatione Verbi; de processione Spiritus S.; dialogus de casu diaboli, de conceptu virginali, de originali peccato, epp., Lib. III., Meditationes XXI. (Opp. omn. ed. *Gerberon*, Paris, 1675) (Paris, 1721, 2 T. f.) *Migne* ser. lat. T. 138–159. *Billroth*, de Anselmi prosl. et monol., Lips. 1832.

---

[1] Anselm says: "Non tento, Domine, penetrare altitudinem tuam, quia nullatenus comparo illi intellectum meum, sed desidero aliquatenus intelligere veritatem tuam, quam credit et amat cor meum. *Neque enim quaero intelligere, ut credam, sed credo, ut intelligam;* nam et hoc credo, quia, nisi credidero, non intelligam (proslog. c. 1.) — Sicut rectus ordo exigit, ut profunda christianae fidei credamus, priusquam ea praesumamus ratione discutere, *ita negligentiae mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus, quod credimus, intelligere.*" (Cur Deus homo, c. 2.)

This method of concluding from a mental conception to its objective reality was assailed by *Gaunilo*, a monk of Marmoutiers, who said that if the argument were valid, it would equally follow that *because one conceives of an island situated in mid-ocean, it must necessarily be there.* Anselm replied by distinguishing between ideas logically *inseparable* and such as are connected by an effort of the imagination. The former have necessarily an objective reality, *because* to conceive of a being as absolutely *necessary* is all one with saying that it exists as one conceives of it.[1]

But the most important of Anselm's works, and the one which has exercised the greatest influence on posterity, marking an epoch in Christian philosophy, is his "*Cur Deus Homo*," in which he demonstrates the necessity of the *incarnation of the Son of God.* Anselm also takes up and discusses with much ability and depth of thought, but yet without *forming a system*, the doctrine of original sin and the harmony between free-will and the foreknowledge of God, in his work entitled "*De Concordia Praescientiae et Praedestinationis.*"

In giving an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, Anselm called attention to the fact that ideas have a real existence. This opinion was vehemently assailed, and occasioned the

CONTROVERSY ON REALISM, NOMINALISM, AND CONCEPTUALISM.[2]

The principles in question in this controversy, instead of involving, as has been asserted, no more than a mere quibble about words, lie at the very foundation of human science, inasmuch as on its issue depends the possibility or impossibility of any demonstration whatever within the scope of knowledge accessible to man. Hence it gave rise to a number of conflicting theological tendencies which, had they not been kept under control, might have led either to idealistic pantheism or brutal materialism. This mediaeval controversy was but an expression, more or less full, of thoughts which at all times, whether ancient or modern, when the spirit of philosophic inquiry has been abroad, have occupied men's minds. The Eleatic philosophers, and Heraclitus, Plato, and Aristotle were no less disturbed by them than Spinoza, Leibnitz, Hegel, and Herbart. The question at issue was a fundamental problem of science, and may be briefly stated as follows: Have universal ideas, or such as comprehend the genus and differential note, an actual existence independent of the conceptions of them formed in individual minds, or is the converse the case—that is to say, are universal ideas mere abstractions, creations of the intellect, expressed in words (nomina) representing substantive realities, but not such themselves? The *Nominalists* held the latter, the *Realists* the former opinion. While it may be assumed that this question would, in any event, have come up to the schoolmen for discussion and solution, it is nevertheless true that it may be historically traced back to Boëthius, the forerunner of mediaeval philosophers, and through him to Porphyry. The latter, in his introduction to the writings of Aristotle on *Categories*, on which Boëthius wrote a commentary, speaking of the five *Universals* (*γένος, εἶδος, διαφορά, ἴδιον, συμβεβηκός* = genus, species, differentia, proprium, accidens), says, at the very outset, that it is not his purpose to enter the field of metaphysics, because of the difficulty and obscurity of the fundamental question of this branch—viz., "Have genus and species (*genera et species*) a substantive existence of their own, or are they mere abstractions of the intellect (*in solis nudis* intellectibus posita sunt)? And further, assuming that they have a substantive existence, are they corporeal or incorporeal? Are they inherent in other objects, or do they subsist of themselves?"

---

[1] *Gaunilo*, lib. pro insipiente; Anselmi apolog. ctr. Gaunilon. respondentem pro insipiente.

[2] *Kleutgen*, Philosophy of Past Ages, Münster, 1861, Vol. I., p. 252 sq. *Stöckl*, History of the Philosophy of the Middle Ages, Vol. I., p. 128–151.

The discussion thus declined by Porphyry was entered upon by Boëthius, who, though possessing considerable ability for the task, was not altogether free from misconceptions of its true bearings. He closes by remarking that the two phases of the question pointed out by Porphyry may be traced back to *Plato* and *Aristotle*, the former of whom, he says, genera et species caeteraque non modo intelligi universalia, verum etiam esse atque propter (*praeter?*) corpora subsistere putat; *Aristoteles* vero intelligi quidem incorporalia atque universalia, sed subsistere *in* sensibilibus putat.

Boëthius did not decide in favor of either view; but, from the fact that he quoted, commented upon, and criticised Aristotle, he seemed to give a preference to Nominalism. *Scotus Erigena* endeavored (*de divis. nat. I.* 51) to harmonize the conflicting views of Plato and Aristotle; but, for obvious reasons, little or no attention was paid to what he had said on the subject by the schoolmen, who preferred to follow the question back to its origin.

Plato, as is well known, in accounting for the multiplicity of concrete substances, whether in regard to their essence or their supreme genus, assumes the prototypal idea as a basis. With him, ideas (*εἶδος*) are prototypes and patterns (*παραδείγματα*), which the "Demiurge," the "Maker of the Universe," has before His mind in drawing order out of chaos. In this view only, ideas possess truth and unity. They exist in "the great mind of Zeus" anteriorly to their antitypes, are independent of finite matter and form, and are self-subsistent, both as to their being and meaning. The concrete world of matter and form is only a partial (*participans*) manifestation of the prototypal idea, and will ever remain inadequate to its full expression.

To Plato's deductive method *Aristotle* opposed a thorough-going induction. Starting with concrete *realities* as they come before the eye in nature, or before the mental vision in the facts of history, science, and art, he separated and classified them according to their categorical notes. Denying the transcendentalism of Plato, he held that ideas are inherent *in things*, or exist primarily in the concrete (*universalia in re*), whence they are derived by the mental process of abstraction. The idea (*το εἶδος*), he said, is absolutely without meaning until *after* it has been embodied in concrete form, where it becomes the immanent and individualizing (*σύνολον*) principle of the several objects in which it is embodied. It is the province of science, he added, to collect, investigate, compare, distinguish, and arrange specimens, examples, and facts, and thus, by abstracting the notes common to a class or individual, and corresponding to the reality, to fix the notion of either permanently in a precise and comprehensive definition.

This twofold *Realism*, embracing, in a sense, a transcendentalism of ideas, and yet insisting on their immanence in the concrete object or fact, was opposed by the *Nominalism* of *Zeno* and the *Stoics*, who asserted that ideas have no real existence *independently of the intellect*, whether considered in the *mind of the Creator* or in *individual beings* (universalia *post rem*), and that universals are but empty names (*nomina, flatus vocis*), and nothing more.

The diverging opinions to which this controversy gave rise, involving, as they did, the most momentous problem of science, were still as far asunder as ever when Christianity came into the world, and with it the *idea of creation*, to which there was nothing similar in the whole range of antiquity. This cardinal fact afforded a means of ascertaining the true relation of God to ideas, of ideas to reality, and of reality to human knowledge. Now that the true starting point of science had been discovered, the most enlightened of *Christian* philosophers endeavored to harmonize and retain the underlying principles of both the Platonic and Aristotelian theories. They upheld, as the only view consistent with the genius of Christianity, the *Realism* of both the *universal* or prototypal and the *particular* or individual idea. Still, there was no age of the Christian era when the advocates of Nominalism did not exist side by side with the advocates of this modified Realism.

The theologians of the school of Alexandria, and notably Origen, depending for their philosophical notions chiefly on Plato, were unable either to fully understand or properly appreciate the theory of the realists. The schoolmen, on the other hand, drawing their philosophical notions from the copious writings of *St. Augustine*, who had prepared the way for Realism, adopted neither the Platonic nor the Aristotelian theory, but took a middle way between the two. *Anselm*, the Augustine of the schools (*alter Augustinus*), led off as the champion of the new and true theory of Realism. While establishing the relative subsistence of universals, and showing how individuals are separated from each other by differential notes, he at the same time points out that there is an essential connection between the two, inasmuch as the universal is realized in the individual. Holding, therefore, that universals were not, according to the Nominalist theory, mere sounds of the voice, nor yet, as the out-and-out Realist taught, substances in the external world, but "conceptions" or thoughts in the mind, he drew the further conclusion that when one is *necessitated* to conceive of an object as being such and such, the reality *must* correspond to the conception. Such was the theory held by the bulk of the schoolmen who lived after Anselm, during the early half of the present epoch.

In opposition to this theory, others of the schoolmen revived *Nominalism* under the following form: 1. Only individual objects, inasmuch as they are directly perceived by the senses, have any real existence. Whatever is over and above these is simply a sort of mental mirage, which the imagination connects with realities. Hence, 2. Perception by the senses, being the only means of apprehending realities and becoming conscious of their presence, is the one true method of acquiring knowledge. The latter of these conclusions, however, was not fully set forth by the Nominalists until the fourteenth century.

The Nominalist theory was applied by *Roscelin*, Canon of Compiègne, to the dogma of the Trinity. Affirming the existence of *individuals* only, he held that universals were a mere sound of the voice—a *flatus vocis* as fleeting as the breath that called it forth. Neither had qualities, parts, or any existence outside of the objects to which they belonged. The color of a horse, for instance, has, he said, no ideal independent existence apart from the horse of which it is an accidental quality. His Nominalism led him straight into *tritheism*. He spoke of the Three Persons in the Trinity as *tres res*, understanding by the term *res* an entirety; the Aristotelian *τί*, or a substance complete in itself.[1] Thus he denied the unity of the Godhead and affirmed the separate existence of three Gods.

This position brought him into a controversy with *Anselm*,[2] who assailed his adversaries with the following arguments: "How," said he, "can one distinguish God and His various relations (i. e., the Divinity, the Divine Essence, and the Three Divine Persons) who can not draw a distinction between a horse and its color? One who can not comprehend that there is a sense in which men may be said to be essentially one (which would not be the case if the generic idea 'man' were no more than an abstraction or an empty name) is but ill-qualified to recognize in the Divine nature Three Persons, each truly God, and yet all one and the same God. If, finally, human nature has a real existence only in this or that determinate and individual person, how is it possible even to conceive of the Divine Word becoming man, since He did not assume a human personality, but took upon Him human nature?"

---

[1] See *Blunt's* Dictionary of Sects and Heresies, art. Schoolmen. (Tr.)

[2] *Joh. Monach.* ep. ad Anselm. (*Baluz.*, Miscell., l. IV., p. 478 sq.) Anselm., l. II., ep. 35, 41; lib. de fide Trin. et de incarnat. Verbi cont. blasphemias Ruzelini., cf. Ivo Carnot. ep. VII. Abaelardi ep. 21; Theobald. Stamp. ep. ad Roscel (*d'Achéry*, Spicil., T. III., p. 448.) *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed.*, Vol. IX., p. 388–397; Fr. tr., Vol. 20, p. 429–440.

Anselm pronounced Nominalism a dialectical heresy, and Abelard, some time later, affected to be witty when he said that, according to Roscelin, our Lord (St. John xxi. 13) offered His disciples not a real fish, but only the word "fish." Anselm's *realistic theory* received the approbation of the council of Soissons (1092), while Roscelin was ordered to retract his as erroneous. *Hildebert*, Bishop of Mans,[1] who died about 1134, pursued the line of thought marked out by Anselm. Such was the mental process by which the schoolmen harmonized Realism and Nominalism, and established the theory of *Conceptualism.* The conceptualists drew a distinction between objective reality, intellectual conception, and the word expressing the idea formed by the mind. They said that as the intellect could not adequately comprehend all the notes of an object, so neither could language adequately express *them*, and that the intellectual comprehension held a place midway between an object and the word by which it was designated.

This much was indeed an approach toward the solution of the difficulty, but the fundamental question involved in the controversy between the Realists and Nominalists had not yet been cleared up.[2]

§ 254. *Controversy concerning Scholasticism and Mysticism—Abelard, Gilbertus Porretanus, and St. Bernard.*

Epp. *Abaelardi* et *Heloisae*, epecially ep. I. de historia calamitatum suarum; Introductio ad theol., libb. III. (Abaelardi et Heloisae Opp. ed. *du Chesne*, Paris, 1616, 4to; sometimes given as ed. Amboise, 1606 or 1626. Abridgment by *Cramer*, Vol. VI., p. 337 sq.) Theol. christ., Lib. V. (*Martène*, Thes. anecdot., T. V.) Ethica s. liber: *scito te ipsum* (*Pezii*, Anecdot., T. III., P. II.) Dialog. inter philosoph. Judaeum et Christian. (Abael.?) ed. *Rheinwald*, Berol. 1831. — Sic. et non. Dialectica (*Victor. Cousin*, Ouvrages inédits d'Abaelard., Paris, 1836, 4to). "*Sic et non*," primum integrum edd. *Henke* et *Lindenkohl*, Marb. 1851. *Abaelardi* Epitome Theol. chr. ed. *Rheinwald*, Berol. 1835. *Migne*, Ser. Lat.,

---

[1] (Tract. theologicus, probably due to Hugh of St. Victor); Moralis Philosophia (Opp. ed. *Beaugendre*, Paris, 1708 f.)

[2] *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 143–151.

T. 178. The *Hymns* brought to light, published by *Greith* in the Spicileg. Vatican. and by *Cousin;* see *Freiburg Gazette*, Vol. XI., p. 141-158. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 218-272. Concerning Abelard's life, see Hist. littéraire de la France, T. XII.; *Schlosser*, Abelard and Dolcino, or the Life of a Fanatic and of a Philosopher, Gotha, 1807. *Ueberweg*, p. 132 sq.

The controversy commenced by Berengarius and Lanfranc, which was in fact a conflict between speculative and positive theology, involving an attack on faith as the source of intellectual enlightenment, was continued under a more scientific form by Abelard and St. Bernard, when it took the shape of a war between Mysticism and Scholasticism, and threatened to loosen the foundations of the whole range of theology.

Peter Abelard was born of noble parents, at *Palais*, near *Nantes*, in Brittany, in 1079. Inheriting from his father a thirst for knowledge, he applied himself to study with all the ardent enthusiasm of his nature, and was still further stimulated to renewed efforts by Roscelin, his first master. Of a naturally acute and subtle mind, he early manifested a decided inclination for dialectics, and in consequence went to hear the praelections of *William of Champeaux* (Guil. a Campellis), who was then defending the claims of *science* against the Nominalists, as Anselm had already done those of theology against the same errorists. His progress was so rapid that he soon outstripped his master. Elated by his success, and thirsting for distinction and worldly applause, he withdrew from Paris and founded a school of his own at Melun, whither great troops of students flocked to hear him. Over-exertion impaired his health, and he retired to his home in Brittany to restore it. In the meantime William of Champeaux had taken up his residence at the abbey of St. Victor, near Paris, and commenced to teach rhetoric and dialectics. Here, Abelard came to put himself once more under his old master, but it was not long before he again quarreled with him. He has left the following account of the cause of this rupture:

"William of Champeaux maintained that 'universals' belong essentially to individuals in such sense, that individuals comprehended in the same class are not distinct from each other as to their essence, but only distinguished one from another by the number of their accidental notes. He subsequently modified this opinion. After a discussion with Abelard, he taught that 'universals'—i. e., genus and species—are not essentially inherent in individual objects, but are the mental conception of a class, and are derived from a consideration of individual specimens. (*Sic correxerit sententiam ut deinceps eamdem rem non essentialiter sed individualiter diceret.*)

"The question of 'universals' is one that has at all times been of the highest importance to dialecticians, and so difficult is it that even *Porphyry*, in his *Isagoge*, without attempting to solve it, simply puts it aside with the remark that 'it is a vexed question.'

"William having thus, rather from necessity than of his own motion, changed his opinion, found himself deserted by those who had formerly come to hear him, as if dialectics was wholly dependent on this or that theory of universals."[1]

Abelard once more withdrew from Paris, and reopened his school at Melun, whence he transferred it to Mount St. Geneviève, near Paris, in 1115, and so great was the popularity of his teaching that the students deserted the auditory of William of Champeaux to listen to his more brilliant rival. He preserved, amid every change of fortune, a strong filial attachment for his mother, and when she had resolved upon becoming a religious, he dismissed his students temporarily to pay her a visit. During his absence, William had been appointed Bishop of Châlons, and on his return to Paris, believing that his talents had not a sufficiently large field for their display, he went to Laon to listen to the lectures of the celebrated theologian, *Anselm of Laon*. After a short stay, fancying that he had got abreast of his master, and was, if anything, his superior, he boastfully proposed to give a course of lectures on Ezechiel, one of the most difficult of the prophets, if a day's time were given to him for preparation. Anselm's jealousy was aroused, as that of William of Champeaux had been for a similar cause on a former occasion, and Abelard, finding Laon disagreeable, returned to Paris, where he became one of the most celebrated teachers of dialectics and theology. At this time there lived in Paris, Heloise, the niece of Canon *Fulbert*, then only eighteen years of age, but already remarkable for beauty of person, mental endowments, and extensive knowledge. Abelard became her preceptor, and, while the two were in each other's company, he lost sight of the honor attaching to his office and abused the confidence reposed in him; and she, relaxing the dignified reserve which is the safeguard of the sex, threw aside the observances of virginal modesty. Fulbert discovered his mistake when it was too late. The two fled together, and were secretly married, but so wild was Heloise's enthusiasm for her lover, that she denied the fact, lest it might be a bar to his advancement in the Church. Fulbert, enraged at this denial, and still further exasperated because he believed that Abelard, desiring now to be rid of Heloise, had her removed to the convent of Argenteuil, hired five venal men to emasculate the betrayer of his niece. The unfortunate man, to hide his shame and bring some alleviation to his sorrow, entered the monastery of St. Denys as a monk, and persuaded Heloise to take the veil at Argenteuil (1119). He was not long permitted to remain quiet in his monastery. Petitions from the university students came pouring in upon him, requesting him to resume his lectures, and to do now for love of God what he had formerly done for personal glory. He yielded, and opened his lectures in a priory belonging to the monastery of St. Denys, and situated on the border of the province of Count Theobald of Champagne. The numbers who flocked to hear him were so great that accommodations could not be had to lodge them nor food to sustain them. The advocates of Scholasticism, but notably Albert and Lothaire of Rheims, soon grew jealous of his splendid success, and even the Mystics commenced to complain that his treatment of the mysteries bordered on the irreverent. At the request of his disciples, he commenced to embody his theological teaching in a work entitled an "*Introduction to Theology*," treating specially of the *Trinity*, and from which several *heretical propositions* were extracted. The work was condemned by the council of Soissons, in 1121, and he himself confined in a monastery to do penance. His sufferings excited universal sympathy, and, after a few days, *Conon*, the papal legate, permitted him to return to St. Denys. He was no sooner back than he again evoked the anger of the monks by asserting that Denys, Bishop of Paris and founder of the monastery, was not identical with Denys the Areopagite, and was forced to consult for his safety in flight. Having been released from his connection with the monastery by the celebrated Abbot Suger, he retired to Nogent-on-the-Seine, in the diocese of Troyes, and here built himself a hermitage of reeds and straw, which he dedicated to the Holy Ghost and called the *Paraclete*. Here he again commenced his lectures, and soon throngs of students crowded to the spot, built huts for themselves and a chapel for their master, whither he might withdraw and find peace and solace in his sufferings. His fame and his teachings exposed him to fresh persecutions, and, transferring the Paraclete, which, by reason of the poetical traditions surrounding it, remained, until 1593, a favorite female religious house, to Heloise and her community, he withdrew from public notice and accepted the abbacy of St. Gildas-de-Ruys, in Brittany (1128). After eight years spent in useless efforts to restore the discipline of the monastery, he resigned the office in 1136, and spent a year giving lectures in Paris. It was now that St. Bernard, the most renowned man of his age, became his opponent. Having had his attention drawn to the errors of Abelard by *William*, Abbot of Thierry, and *St. Norbert*, he set about refuting them, and pointedly reminded Abelard that he had confounded the teachings of faith with the theories of philosophy.[1] Moreover, Abelard had dressed up in a new, more pointed, and more offensive shape the errors of his "*Introduction to Theology*," already condemned, in his new work entitled "*On Christian Theology*," but which was little more than a revised edition of the former. He and his partisans were also charged with profaning holy things by an unusual and unseemly display of temper in their disputations. St. Bernard, in sending an account of the affair to Rome, expressed himself in the following indignant language: "*Irridetur simplicium fides, eviscerantur arcana Dei, insultatur Patribus, omnia usurpat sibi humanum ingenium.*"

---

[1] In Abelardi historia calamitatum, c. 2. Cf. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 140–143.

Abelard, apprehending his condemnation as a heretic, requested the Archbishop of Sens to give him the privilege of publicly defending himself against his accusers. Bernard reluctantly accepted the challenge, and repaired to Sens, where a synod was held (1140) for the purpose of giving a fair hearing to each party. Contrary to all expectation, Abelard refused to defend his teachings, which had already been condemned by the synod, before that body, and, on the following day, appealed from its decision to the judgment of the Pope. On information forwarded to Rome by the synod and obtained from numerous letters written by St. Bernard, the teachings of Abelard were condemned and himself sentenced to perpetual confinement in a monastery. He had arrived at Lyons, on his way to Rome, when the sentence reached him, and, turning back, sought refuge with Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, through whose kind offices he obtained absolution from the Pope, and was reconciled to St. Bernard.[1] He became one of the monks of Clugny, and, while there, led a strictly ascetical life, spending much of his time in teaching the monks. His health having given way, he was removed to the priory of St. Marcel, at Chalons-on-the-Saône, on account of its more healthy location, where he died a most exemplary death, professing his adherence to the orthodox faith, April 21, 1142.

---

[1] *Bernardi*, epp. 188, 189 ad Cardinal.; ad Innoc de erroribus Abaelardi. Apologie d'Abélard, ep. 20 (Opp., p. 330 sq.)

The words of Peter the Venerable, in reference to Abelard's life while at Clugny, are certainly very laudatory. "It has not been my fortune," said he, "to meet a more humble man than he." At *his own* request, his body was conveyed to Heloise at the Paraclete, "in order," he said, "that she may learn what one loves in loving man."[2] She survived him twenty years. The ashes of both were taken to Paris in 1808, and, in 1828, buried in one sepulchre in Père-la-Chaise.

Besides the errors already pointed out, Abelard also went very much astray in discussing the relations between *faith* and reason (*fides, ratio*), maintaining that faith proceeds from scientific investigation; because, said he, *doubt*[3] is the fundamental principle of all knowledge, the key that opens the treasures of wisdom. Allowing to dialectics a supreme authority in the domain of dogmatic truth, it was not possible, by this logical process, to attain to absolute truth, but only to *probability*. According to his fundamental principle, everything capable of proof must first be susceptible of doubt, and hence all the dogmas of faith were necessarily assumed to be problematic, that they might be demonstrable. To show this by example, Abelard took various propositions of faith and morals, and placed by the side of them texts of Scripture and passages from the writings of the Fathers, telling *for* and *against* each, and apparently contradictory of one another, without attempting to reconcile them. Such is the structure of the remarkable treatise "*Sic et Non*."[1] It appears to have been his purpose in this to awaken a spirit of rational doubt among the better educated; for "doubt," he said, "leads to inquiry, and inquiry to truth." His definition of faith is especially startling. To believe, said he, is *to hold as true* what one sees not, and to hold also as true the motive of believing in what is unseen. His explanation of the *Trinity* differed little from the Modalism of Sabellius. According to the latter, the Trinity was not one of distinct persons, but of action and office, the Eternal Unit manifesting itself in time under the three forms or modes of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. According to Abelard, the Father, or, more properly, the Paternity (*Paternitas*), is the First and Supreme Divinity, who manifests Himself in the Son and Holy Ghost. These, of themselves, have no existence (*aliae vero duae personae nullatenus esse queant*). The Father alone has a real existence, has relations to the world, and is manifested in it.[2]

---

[1] The History of the Councils of *Soissons* and *Sens*, and Abelard's life and teachings, very carefully detailed by *Hefele*, Vol. V., pp. 321–325, 399–435.

[2] Petri Venerabilis ep. ad Helois. and Helois. ad Petr. Abaelardi (Opp., p. 337 sq.) *Ratisbonne*, History of St. Bernard; Germ. transl. by *Reiching*, Vol. II., pp. 37, 38.

[3] Abelard, however, said (Epitome Theol. christ., c. 2): "Ac primum de fide, quae naturaliter caeteris prior est, tanquam bonorum omnium fundamentum." He is more explicicit in his Introduct. in Theol., Lib. II.; but he wandered far from these ideas when he maintained: "Haec quippe prima sapientiae clavis

---

definitur: assidua scilicet seu frequens interrogatio; *dubitando* enim ad inquisitionem veniemus. (in Sic et Non, in Prolog. sub fin.) Quod fides humanis rationibus sit adstruenda." (Ibid., p. 18–22.) Cf. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 609 sq. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 224–234. †*Haid*, Abelard and his Doctrine relative to the Church and to Dogma, Ratisbon, 1863. *Cousin.*, l. c.

[1] Recently discovered at Munich, and published by Professor Rheinwald, 1835.

[2] St. Bernard animadverts upon Abelard in such terms as these: "Antiquos jam et ab ecclesia damnatos errores; cum de Trinitate loquitur, sapit *Arium*, cum de gratia, sapit *Pelagium*, cum de persona Christi, sapit *Nestorium*."

Finally, St. Bernard combatted a seemingly erroneous proposition of Abelard's *Ethics*, according to which not the character of the *act*, but the *intention*, is the only criterion of morality.[1]

Abelard has himself left us the best account of the motives by which he was led into error. "*Pride, not ignorance*," said he, "*is the root of heresy;*" thereby justifying what St. Bernard said of him: "There is nothing in Heaven or on earth that he does not claim to know." It is more than likely that his fame as a philosopher and theologian would long since have been at least considerably diminished, if not entirely obscured, had it not been supplemented by the romance of his life.

Gilbert de la Porrée, first a professor of philosophy at Paris, and, after the year 1142, Bishop of Poitiers, his native city († 1154), carried the subtile distinctions of philosophy into the pulpit. His two archdeacons, *Arnold* and *Calon*, took exception to some of his philosophical speculations on the Blessed Trinity, and brought them under the notice of Pope *Eugene III.* and St. Bernard.[2] When Eugene III. came to France, Gilbert was summoned first to Paris, in 1147, and, the following year, before a synod held at Rheims, at which the Pope was personally present. Owing to certain nominalistic errors contained in his commentary on the first book of (Pseudo) Boëthius on the *Trinity*, he was accused of Tritheism. He had drawn a distinction between the two senses in which the name God is used—the one meaning the *Divine Essence* or *Being* (*substantia quae est Deus*); the other, the properties by which each of the Three Persons is distinguished from the others, and *in virtue of which each is God* (*substantia quâ est Deus*). Still drawing out the consequences of this distinction, he asserted that the Second Person, but not the

---

[1] Quia opera indifferentia sunt in se, nec bona nec mala, sive remuneratione digna videantur, nisi secundum radicem intentionis, quae est arbor bonum vel malum proferens fructum. Comment. in ep. ad Rom., Lib. I., p. 522. (Tr.)

[2] Particularly on account of his commentary on Boëthius de Trin. Cf. *Mansi*, T. XXI., p. 728 sq. *D'Argentré*, T. I., p. 39 sq. *Hefele*, Vol. V., pp. 445–450, 460–463. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 272–288. *Ueberweg*, 3 ed., p. 145 sq.

Divine Nature, had become incarnate. Eugene III., after listening for some time to the equivocal explanations of Gilbert, candidly asked him: "My dear brother, do you or do you not believe that the Being in whom you recognize Three Persons is God?" Gilbert answered in the negative, taking exception to the word "*Being*," because the Three Persons, according to him, were numerically distinct, being *three* units,[1] or "*tria singularia*." After a lengthy and fruitless discussion of the points at issue, St. Bernard drew up a confession of faith in opposition to the errors of Gilbert, which, owing to the opposition of the cardinals, who thought the Pope unduly under the influence of his old teacher, and held that it was the exclusive prerogative of the Roman Church to decide on questions of faith, was not accepted as a publicly recognized document. The Pope compromised matters, expressing himself content with a promise made by Gilbert not to introduce Nominalism, for the future, into his teaching on the Trinity. With the concurrence of the synod, four obnoxious chapters of his work were censured.

§ 255. *Attempts to Check the Vagaries of Speculation—Robert Pulleyne, Peter Lombard, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor.*

Alb. Liebner, Hugh of St. Victor and the theological tendency of his age, Lps. 1832. *Engelhard*, Richard of St. Victor and John Ruysbrock, Erlangen, 1839. *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, Vol. IX., p 717 sq. Fr. tr., Vol. 21, p. 346 sq.

From these errors and disputations, it was clear that, to pursue philosophical and theological speculations with any hope of gaining profit from them, caution and prudence were necessary. As a step in this direction, *Robert Pulleyne* (*Robertus Pullenus*), successively professor of theology at Paris and Oxford, whence he was called to Rome by Pope Eugene III. 1144), created cardinal, and appointed chancellor of the Roman Church († 1153), again brought the teaching of St. Anselm into special prominence, insisting that to arrive at divine truth, faith must precede science, not science faith. This method he drew out more fully in his writings, where he placed beside his purely rational conclusions the *traditional authority of the Fathers of the Church,* following the general structure of the work of *Isidore of Seville,* entitled "*Three Books of Sentences*" ("*Sententiarum Libri Tres*"). Even St. Bernard bears witness to the purity of his doctrine. It is a little remarkable that Pulleyne, whether in direct argument or in answering objections, invariably employs the *syllogistic form.*

---

[1] *St. Thomas*, Summa. Theol., Pt. I., Qu. XXVIII., art. 2, asks: "Utrum relatio in Deo sit idem quod sua essentia?" and says in corpore articuli: "Respondeo dicendum quod circa hoc dicitur Gilbertus Porretanus errasse, sed errorem suum postmodum in Rhemensi concilio revocasse. Dixit enim, *quod relationes in divinis sunt assistentes*, sive extrinsecus affixae. — Sed Gilbertus Porretanus consideravit relationem solummodo secundum hoc quod est *commune* accidentibus—i. e., inesse subjecto; et sic relationes inveniuntur assistentes, non intrinsecus affixae. Si vero consideretur relatio secundum quod est accidens, sic est inhaerens subjecto, et habens esse accidentale in ipso." (Tr.)

The tendency of *Peter Lombard* in the same direction is still more marked and emphatic. Born of poor parents, at Novara, in Lombardy, but richly endowed with mental gifts, he became the protégé of a wealthy gentleman, who sent him to Bologna to be educated. Some time later, he attracted the notice of St. Bernard, who placed him in the school of Rheims, where he became a pupil of Abelard's and completed his studies, but not until he had acquired a considerable familiarity with the Fathers, and particularly with SS. Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. He soon obtained a professorship in theology at Paris, when he composed (c. A. D. 1140) his celebrated *dogmatic manual,* entitled "*Four Books of Sentences*" ("*Sententiarum Libri IV.*"), modestly compared by himself to the mite cast by the widow into the treasury of the Temple, which was studied and commented on down to the time of the Reformation. Closely adhering to the teaching of the Fathers, he evinced considerable originality in his method of treatment and philosophic proofs, thus combining positive and speculative or scholastic theology. The object of his work, as stated by himself, is "to put forward the strength of the Church's faith, to disclose the hidden treasures of theological research, and to make plain the meaning of the holy sacraments."[1]

---

[1] *Petri Lombardi* Sententiar. libb. IV., Ven. 1477; rec. *J. Aleaume,* Lovan. 1546; Antv. 1647 and oftener; in *Migne,* Ser. Lat., T. 191, 192, together with *Bandinus.* According to the division indicated above, he treats, in Book I., of

Following the distinction of St. Augustine, Peter Lombard, in this work, divides whatever comes within our knowledge into *things* and *signs*. Things are subdivided in those intended *for use* and those set apart *for enjoyment* (*uti et frui*). The latter contribute to our happiness, the former to its attainment. *To enjoy*, he says, is to become attached to an object from love of it. *To use* an object means to employ it in securing what one wishes to enjoy. Now, the proper object of enjoyment is *God*, the Trinity; relatively also *angels* and men, the *world* being the means to be employed in the attainment of this object. Hence all doctrinal teaching is naturally divided into two parts—the first embracing the Trinity, and the second the world and its relations to God (theology and cosmology). By *signs* are understood the Sacraments.[1]

As to *method*, Peter Lombard, after stating the doctrine of the Church in each instance, supports his proposition by pertinent texts of Holy Scripture and passages from the Fathers. He next adds certain considerations of his own, takes up objections and solves them with great subtlety and dialectical skill, and finally speaks of the opinions of contemporaries.[2]

The work of Peter Lombard met with much opposition before it obtained general recognition and eccclesiastical sanction. He was accused to Pope Alexander III. of holding the following propositions: "*Christus non est aliquis homo;* and, *Christus secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid* (Lib. III., dist. 6, 7); also

---

the Trinity; in Book II., of creation and the relations of the creature to God; Book III., of redemption, faith, hope, and charity, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, the virtues and their relations to each other and to sin; Book IV., of the Sacraments and the Last Things. Peter, above all, shows the tendency of his work in the *Prologus:* "Lucernam veritatis in candelabro exaltare volentes, in labore multo ac sudore hoc volumen (Deo praestante) compegimus, ex testimoniis veritatis in aeternum fundatis in IV. libros distinctum. In quo majorum exempla doctrinamque reperies, in quo per dominicae fidei sinceram professionem vipereae doctrinae fraudulentiam prodidimus, aditum demonstrandae veritatis complexi, nec periculo impiae professionis incerti, temperato inter utrumque moderamine utentes. Sicubi vero parum vox nostra insonuit, non a paternis discessit limitibus." For a resumé of the whole work, see *Bossuet-Cramer*, Vol. VI., p. 586–754, and *Raumer*, Vol. VI., p. 251–278. Cf. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 391–411. There is a close affinity between the *Libri IV. Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard and the otherwise unknown *Bandini*, or Baudini and Bauduini Lib. IV. Sententiarum, ed. studio *Chelidonii*, Viennae, 1519 (Lovan. 1555), which is evidently, and now also in the opinion of all, but an abridgment of the work of Peter Lombard, but not by any means the basis for the more exhaustive work of the latter.

[1] Cf. Lib. I., distinct. 1.

[2] "This work constituted him, by preëminence, *Magister Sententiarum*, and gave inexhaustible material for commentators. The compilation was an enormous boon to the hair-splitting dialectician, for the number of analogies and discrepancies, the questions and answers, theses and antitheses, positions and counter-positions, that it helped to develop and to solve. It made scholastic formalism yet more dry, and while it raised to its highest position the influence of authority and tradition, it threatened to fossilize forever the rich products of theology." *Blunt's* Dict. of Heresies, art. Schoolmen. (Tr.)

ibid., dist. 10), *an Christus, secundum quod homo, sit persona vel aliquid?*" The truth of the matter is, that the Master of Sentences had indeed discussed these questions after his fashion, brought forward the arguments *for* and *against*, but without giving a decision either way. While, on the one hand, therefore, the synod of Tours (1163) and that of Paris, convened at the request of William, Archbishop of Sens, and with the approval of Pope Alexander III., before each of which the subject was brought, refused to formally condemn the Master of sentences; on the other, the Twelfth Ecumenical Council of 1215 defended his name against the misrepresentation of Joachim of Floris.

In 1159, Peter was, with the general approval of the public, appointed Bishop of Paris. Prince Philip, brother of the King of France, who was likewise a candidate for the dignity, after hearing Peter's name mentioned in connection with it, generously withdrew his pretensions. The new bishop was so careful to retain his former simplicity, that when his mother, an Italian peasant, was presented to him clad in splendid apparel, he refused either to recognize her or show her the filial affection of a son until she had put off her rich garments and come in her usual attire. At his death, in 1164, *Hugh*, Archbishop of Sens, in a letter of condolence addressed to the Chapter of Paris, said of him: "I have lost a portion of my soul, the stay of my youth, the comforter and guide of my life." The spirit of Peter Lombard long survived in those who came after him, and the schoolmen esteemed it a pleasure and an honor to comment on his Sentences.[1]

He was succeeded in the professor's chair at Paris by *Peter of Poitiers*, one of his most distinguished pupils, who at first explained the Books of Sentences, but after a time brought out a manual of his own, entitled "*Five Books of Sentences*" ("*Lib. V. Sententiarum*), in which dialectics holds a more prominent place than was accorded to it by the Master of Sentences, and the *syllogistic method* is employed in demonstration.

As in the early days of the Church, so now it was deemed important to present the claims of faith to the minds of infidels as the most efficient way to compel their *belief*. To convert Pagans and Mohammedans, said *Alanus of Ryssel* (*ab*

---

[1] For the reasons of this close following of the Lombard, see *Braniss*, Review of the Progress and Development of Philosophy in Ancient Times and during the Middle Ages, Breslau, 1842, p. 345 sq.

insulis, *l'Isle—Lille*), the first step should be to direct their attention, not to the authority of the Fathers, but to proofs drawn from reason. Such proofs can lead one to faith, but having arrived here, their office ends. *Faith* goes alone the rest of the way, and finally conducts to true science.[1]

He was still more in earnest than his predecessor in his efforts to reduce the methods of teaching theology to scientific form, and seemed inclined to establish for this science, in imitation of geometry, a number of theorems, the one dependent on the other, and the last a resting on axioms and definitions.

Alanus was born in 1114, entered the Cistercian Order of St. Bernard in 1129, became afterward Abbot of la Rivour, and finally, in 1151, Bishop of Axerre († 1202 or 1203). Owing to the variety of his attainments and the number and importance of his writings, he was called by his contemporaries *Alanus the Great* (*Alanus Magnus*), also the *Universal Doctor* (*Doctor Universalis*).

In the *Abbey of St. Victor*, at Paris, founded by William of Champeaux, of which *Hugh* and *Richard* were the most distinguished ornaments and ablest writers, a disposition to harmonize the two divergent theological tendencies of that epoch began to manifest itself.

Hugh, the friend of St. Bernard, and to whom Peter Lombard was in part indebted for his teaching, was descended from the counts of Blankenburg, and born in the year 1097, in the territory of Halberstadt. He was placed by *Reinhard*, Bishop of Halberstadt, under the care of the canons of St. Augustine, by whom he was educated. He applied himself diligently to study, picked up information of every kind wherever he could find it, and was not unfrequently laughed at for his inquisitiveness. Of this period of his life he wrote, later on: "I may truthfully say that I thought nothing beneath me that would contribute to my stock of information. Hence I was at pains to learn a host of things which others thought trifling and ridiculous." This thirst for knowledge led him, in spite of the opposition of his parents, to enter, in 1114, the Abbey of St. Victor, at Paris. Like his friend St. Bernard, Hugh, once he had entered the abbey, devoted himself entirely to prayer, meditation, and the study of theology, absolutely refusing to accept the office of prior or abbot. Though never actually taking part in political affairs, he was an interested and intelligent observer of events going on about him. He died, while still in the prime of life and the full vigor of manhood, in 1141. That he was much esteemed by his contemporaries, the titles of honor and distinction they lavished on him amply show. He was called a *Second Augustine*, the *Tongue of Augustine*, and the *Teacher*.

---

[1] Hae vero rationes si homines ad credendum inducant, non tamen ad fidem capessendam plene sufficiunt usquequaque. Thus, formerly, *Clement* of Alexandria and *St. Augustine*, and more recently, above all, *St. Thomas Aquinas* and *Duns Scotus*. Opera: correct. illust. ed. studio *Caroli de Visch.*, Ant. 1654 f.; de arte s. articulis fid. cath. libb. V. (*Pez*, Thesaur. anecdot. noviss., T. I., Aug. Vind. 1721 f.); also libb. II. ctr. Judaeos et Mahometanos ed. *Masson*, Paris, 1612; in *Migne's* ser lat., T. 210.

Though earnestly opposed to the use of philosophy as employed by Abelard, he was none the less a warm advocate of its legitimate use in subserving the purposes of theology. Hugh had been highly endowed by Providence. All the faculties were well balanced. To depth of feeling he united a brilliant imagination, and to a correct judgment an unbending will. He was preëminently an idealist. Hence the sustained elevation of his teaching, his keenness in investigation, his resolute rejection of whatever is useless, coarse, or shallow. Hence, also, his evenness of temper and his aversion to all strife and contention. With such qualifications did Hugh undertake to carry into effect his long-cherished project of harmonizing the divergent tendencies of the two great theological schools of the times. The results of his labors are embodied in a *Cyclopaedia of Scientific Theology*.[1] Being preëminently a child of his age, he was passionately fond of science and philosophy. To seek knowledge, he said, is all one with being a saint. But true knowledge must combine theory with practice,[2] must reach out to all the relations of man, and it is a notable fact that the scholars of the Middle Ages were, as a rule, equally distinguished for exalted principles and untarnished moral character. The monk of St. Victor was indebted for his scientific views to St. Augustine and St. Anselm, and to St. Bernard for his Mysticism. The pupil of two schools of thought, he was unlike either. He made the teachings of each his own; analyzed, classified, and combined them, and the results bore upon them the peculiar characteristics of his own mind. His numerous commentaries, extending over nearly every book of the Bible, proved that he recognized the importance of *method* no less than a conscientious study of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers in scientific investigation.

---

[1] Consult, especially, Didascalia, de more dicendi et meditandi, summa sententiarum, de sacram. fidei chr. (doctrine of faith), Lib. II. (Lib. I. in 12, Lib. II. in 18 sections), Opp, Rouen. 1648, 3 T. f.; in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 175–177.

[2] Hoc utinam ego tam possem subtiliter perspicere, tam competenter enarrare, quam possum ardenter diligere; delectat nempe me, quia valde dulce et jucundum

Hugh's *Sum of Sentences* deserves particular mention. It was published probably about the year 1130, having already appeared as the work of *Hildebert*, Bishop of Mans, under the title of "*Tractatus Theologicus.*" It embraces a complete *system* of Christian dogma,[1] and is long *anterior* to the work of Peter Lombard. As the dogmas are the direct object of faith, and as this, again, includes the whole body of doctrine in the deposit of the Church, the author starts out, with the Fathers as his guides, to investigate what precisely this doctrine is, and then goes on to point out its relations to reason, to the Old Testament revelation, and to the teaching of philosophers. Having in this way set forth the object of faith, or what he calls the *Credo*, and treated of the virtues of *Hope* and *Charity*, he next proceeds to explain the dogmas, following pretty much the order of the Symbol and observing the method which has been pointed out above as peculiar to Peter Lombard. In an important work entitled "*De Sacramentis*," and evidently published much later, he treats *dogma as*

---

est, de his rebus frequenter agere, ubi simul ratione eruditur sensus et suavitate delectatur animus et aemulatione excitatur affectus. He was, perhaps, thinking of *Aug.* de catechizandis rudibus., c. 2.

[1] During the epoch the schoolmen were under the necessity of giving a more *rational* and thorough analysis of the writings of the early Fathers, something similar in theology to what had already been accomplished in the collections of canon law compiled by Burkhard of Worms, Yves of Chartres, and others. They applied themselves particularly to the study of *Origen* (*De principiis*), *Gregory of Nyssa* (λόγος κατηχητὶκὸς ὁ μέγας), *Augustine* (Enchiridion, and Lib. I. de Doctrina Christiana), *Isidore of Seville* (Sententiarum Libri III.), *John Damascene* (De fide orthodoxa). In the monastery of St. Trudo, at the end of the eleventh century, the idea originated of making a *Theological Sum*, which was realized by Abbot Rudolf. That of *William of Champeaux* is still unprinted. Then comes *Abaelardi* Introductio in theologiam christianam, and Theologia Christiana. Finally, the system of *Peter Lombard*, and that of *Hugh of St. Victor*. On the Tractatus Theologicus as a fragment of the Summa Sententiarum of Hugh, see *Liebner*, Hugh of St. Victor, pp. 217, 438.

a whole much more exhaustively and methodically, adhering rather closer than in the *Sum* to its historical development.[1]

Richard of St. Victor, a native of Scotland, whence he passed over to France, entered the abbey of St. Victor, became a pupil of Hugh, was made abbot of the monastery in 1163, and died 1173, pursued the conciliatory policy peculiar to his master. Inferior to the latter in depth of thought and warmth of mystical feeling, he was his superior in *classical* attainments and elegance and purity of style. His *Treatise on the Trinity* is a model of clearness, solidity, and precision. He is entirely original in his efforts *to define precisely his position in relation to Mysticism.*[2] The intellect, said he, in its thirst for knowledge, tends to speculative theology, while the will, always inclined to the practical side, tends to Mysticism.

While Richard and Hugh had thus honestly striven to adjust and harmonize conflicting views and tendencies, in the same way as Peter Lombard had endeavored to reconcile the claims of speculative and positive theology, *Walter* of St. Victor, the successor of Richard in the abbacy, was violently partisan in the advocacy of his own peculiar views, and denounced the four leading schoolmen of his day, characterizing their works as labyrinths of human thought (A. D. 1180).[3] Fortunately, his bias and exaggeration were so apparent that they defeated his object and nullified the influence his works might otherwise have exerted.

The judgment of *John of Salisbury*[4] on the schoolmen was much more temperate. He had studied, by turns, under Abelard and William of Champeaux, had shared the suffering of Thomas à Becket, and, finally, died as Bishop of Chartres, in 1182. A fine classical scholar, but possessing little capacity for deep speculative studies, he nevertheless appreciated philosophy, and recommended its pursuit to others as an excellent moral and practical training for the mind. In his work entitled "*Polycraticus*" he reviews the political condition of his age, and in a second, entitled "*Metalogicus*," speaks of its scientific culture. His *critical* remarks are frequently correct and valuable, and went a long way in correcting the erroneous views of his contemporaries. Among other things, he foretells that the speculative tendency of Scholasticism would eventually lead to error.

---

[1] For a more precise and complete analysis, see *Liebner*, p. 349–484, and *Bossuet-Cramer*, Pt. VI., p. 791–838. Cf. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., pp. 354, 355.

[2] His writings may be divided into three classes: 1. Treatises on Contemplation and Preliminary Preparation (De statu interior. hom., de praeparatione animi ad contemplat. (Benjam. minor), de gratia contemplat. (Benjam. major); 2. Treatises on the Trinity; 3. Exegetical works on several books of the Bible. These are chiefly explanations of difficulties occurring in the Sacred Text, some running commentaries on certain books, and some essays on special subjects, such as the sacrifices of Abraham and David. Opp., Rothemagi, 1640; in *Migne's* ser. lat., T. 196. Cf. *Engelhard*, ll. c., p. 301; *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 355–384.

[3] Contra 4 Labyrinthos (*Abaelard., Petr. Lombard., Petr. Pictav., Gilb. Porretan.*); epitomized in *Bulaei* Hist. Univers. Par., T. II., pp. 200, 402, 562, 629 sq.

[4] *Joan. Salisberiens.* († 1182), Polycraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophor., Libb. VIII., Lugd. 1639; Metalogicus., Libb. IV., Lugd. 1610,

§ 256. *The Mystics.*

Cf. art. "Mysticism," in the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, and the works of *Görres*, *Schmitt*, *Helfferich*, *Noack*, and *Stöckl*, quoted above, p. 732.

We have already had occasion to mention St. Bernard, his friends and disciples. These were the true representative mystics of their age. St. Bernard, while far from being inimical to science, was much more intent upon developing in man a full consciousness of truth by an intimate experience of the heart, growing out of divinely revealed faith, than upon ascertaining a knowledge of it by the laborious investigations of the reasoning faculties. Following the teaching of earlier mystics; he said that the soul might rise to a full knowledge of religious truth by *three degrees of consideration*, the results of which are styled, respectively, *opinion*, *faith*, and *intellectual apprehension*.[1] This thoroughly practical sci-

---

epp. 303 (Max. Bibl., T. XXIII., p. 242). Newly discovered, Entheticus de dogmate philosophor., ed. *Petersen.*, Hamb. 1843; in *Migne's* ser. lat., T. 199. *Reuter*, John of Salisbury, Berlin, 1842. *Schaarschmidt*, The Life, Studies, Writings, and Philosophy of John of Salisbury, Lips. 1862. *Ritter*, Christian Philosophy, Vol. III., p. 605–620. *Stöckl*, Vol. I., p. 411. *Ueberweg*, pp. 147, 148.

[1] Here are those three degrees or *consideratio: Dispensativa*, sensibus utens ad promerendum Deum—opinio; *aestimativa*, quaeque scrutans ad investigandum Deum—fides; *speculativa*, qua homo se in se colligit—excessus, ascensus, ad contemplandum Deum, contemplatio intellectus s. rei invisibilis certa et manifesta notitia.

ence, this true knowledge, this calm, earnest mysticism, is based upon a principle worthy of St. John—viz: "*God is known in proportion as He is loved.*" Prayer, he said, not idle disputation, leads to a knowledge of God. Love is its well-spring, and unless one is penetrated through and through by this love, he can never attain to the blissful vision of God.

The "Mellifluous Doctor," in his treatise "*De Consideratione Sui,*" gives, in the warm language of a glowing and earnest devotion, a full analysis of the experiences of a religious mind, from the first stirrings and impulses of faith, on through the various stages, until it is finally united in ecstasy to God. In two other works, entitled respectively "*De Conversione*" and "*Tractatus de Diligendo Deo,*" this master of the spiritual life draws out, with characteristic force and truthfulness, the trials of a soul in its transition from an unregenerate to a regenerate state, and its yearnings for intimate union and converse with its God.

The *union with God,* said he, so ardently longed for by man, consists not in a fusion of the two natures, but in a conformity of the two wills, or in a fellowship of love. Such is man's *transformation.* Hence, when God is said to be the essence of all things, the expression is to be interpreted in the sense of the above, meaning that all things are through and in and for God, but not that they are the same in essence.

As St. Bernard taught and lived, so also did his friends, the abbots *William of Thierry* († 1152), *Rupert of Deutz* (*Tuitiensis*) († 1135), and *Guerricus of Igny.* *Ecstasy* and *prophecy,* the highest manifestations of asceticism, were reached in *St. Hildegard,*[1] who resided in a monastery, whose ruins may still be seen, on the Rupertsberg, near Bingen, at the confluence of the Nahe and the Rhine († 1179).

Hugh of St. Victor, in the hope of affiliating Mysticism and Scholasticism, collected and arranged systematically the scattered thoughts of St. Bernard favorable to his purpose. With him, the underlying principle of religious science was that one's knowledge of truth is exactly adequate to his interior dispositions. (*Tantum de veritate quisque protest videre, quantum*

---

[1] *Görres,* Christian Mysticism, Vol. I., p. 285.

ipse est.) The means of arriving at perfect science is contemplation, which was lost through original sin, yet can be recovered by supernatural aids. This fixing of the mental vision on things eternal is what is understood by contemplation in the strict sense. When, on the other hand, the faculties are engaged in the consideration of the objects that meet one in the visible world, the mental operation is called rational meditation. Hugh, judging religious life in its relations to theoretical and practical mysticism, divides it into five heads—viz., *reading*, *meditation*, *prayer*, *labor*, and *contemplation.* Under these five terms is all religious life comprehended. The first four call forth and foster practical habits in the just man, and lead him, little by little, along the way to perfection. The last is at once the fruit of the others, and a foretaste of future reward.

Speculative mysticism reached its extreme limit in *Richard of St. Victor.* In his efforts to bring home to the intellect the clear and precise knowledge of God imparted to man by faith and revelation, he was forced to take refuge in the principle of supernatural aid, saying: "*Tantum possumus, quantum posse accepimus; quantum habes gratiae tantum habes potentiae.*" While allowing to reason the fullest scope within its own limits, he holds purity of heart to be an essential condition to correctness of understanding, and, like St. Bernard, believes in ecstatic intuition, or a mental state not reached by any process of thought, but going beyond and superseding all merely mental efforts. "The rational mind," says Richard, "doubtlessly finds in itself an excellent mirror, wherein to see God. For, if God's invisible essence may be known from His works, where can one find the marks which lead to a knowledge of Him more clearly stamped than in that which is His own image?"[1] To attain a fellowship with God, one must practice self-denial, and this can not be done except by supernatural aids. "The form of truth," he says, "of which one gains a knowledge by divine grace, must also be stamped upon the affections by personal endeavor and the concurrent action of grace."[2] "If a proper disposition be wanting, the science of holiness is like a picture without life."[1] Intellectually, man's aim is contemplation; practically, fellowship with God. He distinguishes three stages in one's religious development—in the first of which God is seen by faith; in the second, He is known by reason, and in the third, beheld by contemplation.[2] "The first and second," he goes on to say, "may be attained by man, but the third can not be reached except by an ecstatic transporting of the spirit above itself. The soul raised above itself beholds things in the light of the Godhead, and here human reason shrinks back."[3] Although regarding the ecstatic raising of the soul out of itself as purely a gift of God, he still insists on personal effort as a preliminary condition. "None," says he, "obtain so great a grace without strenuous efforts and ardent longing."[4]

---

[1] De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. lxxii. (Tr.)

[2] De statu interioris hominis, c. xxvi. (Tr.)

§ 257. *Second Period of Scholasticism under the Franciscans and Dominicans.*

The opening of the second period of Scholasticism is marked by two circumstances: First, a more general use of the writings of the Fathers, and, second, a more extensive study and a more correct understanding of the works of Aristotle. Hitherto, the only portion of Aristotle's writings much known was his *Organon*, or Logic, translated into Latin by Boëthius, and containing Porphyry's "Introduction to the Categories."[5] But in the thirteenth century, when universities became numerous and grew into great seats of learning, besides his works on *Dialectics*, also those on *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, and *Ethics*—in fact, all his writings—were studied and his methods adopted in the lecture-hall for scientific purposes and demonstrations. Since, however, the writings of Aristotle came into the West through Spain, and were in consequence adulterated with the errors of Arabs and Jews, which were in turn propagated among the Christians, his physical and metaphysical works were frequently forbidden. But no sooner had the more eminent among the schoolmen made a new series of translations, not, as formerly, from the second-hand versions of the Arabic, but directly from the original Greek text, than Aristotle rose at once in authority and influence, and the schoolmen then appreciated him no less than did St. Augustine, in a former age. Being preëminently the *philosopher of form*, it was but natural that he should be much preferred to Plato. The most distinguished of the schoolmen wrote copious commentaries on nearly all his works, thus demonstrating how highly they esteemed his writings as an armory whence they might borrow weapons for the systematic defense of theology. It is at present coming to be more and more generally acknowledged that the labors of the schoolmen materially contributed to the correct understanding of Aristotelian philosophy and the spread of its influence.[1] Henceforth, also, but notably from the time of Robert Pulleyne, a more rigorous form of reasoning and a closer adherence to the *syllogism* are noticeable. The fresh energy which characterized the Mendicant Orders gave a new impulse to scientific pursuits. They produced a whole galaxy of scholars distinguished by eminent talents, varied and extensive information, and sincere and earnest piety.

---

[1] De eruditione hominis interioris, c. xxxviii. (Tr.)

[2] De contemplatione, c. iv. (Tr.)

[3] Ibid.

[4] De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. lxxiii. (Tr.)

[5] Cf. *Launoius*, De varia Aristot. in acad. Par. fortuna., Par. 1659, 4to; ed. J. H. ab Elswich., Vitemb. 1720. *Jourdain*, Recherches critiq. sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions lat. d'Aristote., Par. (1819) 1844. German trans. Hist. of the Writings of Aristotle during the Middle Ages, with additions by *Stahr*, Halle, 1831. *Schmölders*, Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes., Par. 1842. *† *Haneberg*, The Schools of the Moors during the Middle Ages, Munich, 1851. * *Ritter*, Christian Philos., Vol. III., p. 83 sq. * Art. "Aristotelian Scholastic Philosophy," in the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, Vol. I.; Fr. tr., Vol. I., p. 524. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1-305. *Ueberweg*, p. 153-210.

The first great name in theology that meets us is that of the Englishman, *Alexander of Hales.*[2] Having completed his elementary studies at Oxford, he went to Paris, where he made a course of theology and canon law. In spite of the intrigues and determined hostility of his enemies, he succeeded, after his entrance into the Franciscan Order, in securing a professor's chair at the University of Paris. Besides annotations on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, he wrote the first commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle, and, by the command of Pope Innocent IV., a *Sum of Universal Theology*, in four parts. Adhering closely, in the last-named work, to the structure of the Sentences, he nevertheless gives evidence of considerable originality and great analytical powers in bringing out prominently the main points of his system, thus forming a connecting link between the Sententiaries and the *Summists*. His dialectical skill and great learning merited for him the titles of the *Irrefragable Doctor* and the *Fount of Life*. He died in 1245.

---

[1] "Although not creditable to these latter centuries, when the schoolmen are regarded with a sort of supercilious contempt, it must nevertheless be frankly admitted that the philosophy of Aristotle, though slightly tinctured with error, was better understood in the thirteenth than in our own century." — "Succeeding centuries did no more than exhume, here and there, scattered fragments of the old, half-forgotten traditions of the thirteenth century, and apply them to the solution of new problems to which physical and ethical investigation gave rise." *Ritter*, History of Christian Philosophy, Vol. IV., pp. 187, 522.

[2] Summa Universae Theologiae; Commentarius in libb. IV. sententiar. com-

William of Auvergne, who became Bishop of Paris in 1228 and died in 1248, and was equally competent as an efficient governor and distinguished as a scientist and theologian, pursued in his writings a line of thought somewhat similar to that of Alexander of Hales.

The dialectical tendency was still more rigorously carried out by *Albert the Great*,[1] Count of Bollstädt. Born at Lauingen, not far from Dillingen, in Suabia, in 1193, he studied at Paris, Padua, and Bologna, and entered the Dominican Order in 1223, after which he taught at Hildesheim, Freiburg, Ratisbon, Strasburg, Paris, and Cologne. In 1254,[2] he became the provincial of the Dominican Order, and, in 1260, Bishop of Ratisbon, but resigned this latter office two years later.

---

mentarius in libb. Arist. de anima, Ven. 1576; Col. 1622, 4 T. f. *Ueberweg*, p. 185–189.

[1] Opera omnia, ed. *Jammy*, Lugd. 1651, 21 T. f.: Commentaries on almost all the works of Aristotle (4 T.); Natural Philosophy (2 T.); Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures (5 T.); Commentary on *Denys the Areopagite* (T. XIII.); Commentary on the Sentences of the Lombard (3 T.); Summa Theologiae (3 T.) Cf. †*Sighart*, Albertus Magnus, Ratisbon, 1857. On Albertus Magnus' Natural Philosophy, see *Alexander von Humboldt*, Cosmos, Vol. II., p. 281–284. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 352–421. Albertus Magnus and the Science of his Age, in *Historical* and *Political Papers*, Vol. LXXIII., year 1874, p. 485–514.

[2] Not 1239. See *Vaughan*, S. Thomas of Aquin, Vol. I., p. 122, and *Sighart*, l. c., p. 84. (Tr.)

The remainder of his life was spent at Cologne in teaching and writing. He was styled the *Universal Doctor* and the *Second Aristotle.* He died November 15, 1280. For *extent* and *variety* of information on every subject then within the scope of human knowledge, but particularly for his ability as a physicist, he stands unrivaled, except by one name, in the thirteenth century—that of his pupil, *St. Thomas Aquinas.*

Bonaventure, whose original name, as well as that of his father, was John of Fidanza, was born at Bagnarea, not far from Viterbo, in Tuscany, about the year 1221. In 1248, he became a Franciscan monk; in 1253, a professor of theology at Paris, where he obtained the title of the *Seraphic Doctor*, and, in 1256, General of his Order.[1] This wonderful man was so conspicuous for purity of life that Alexander of Hales used to say of him: "*Verus Israëlita, in quo Adam non peccasse videtur.*" Bonaventure, though of an eminently practical turn of mind, endeavors to combine with the mystical element speculative dialectics, as is evident from his intimate knowledge of Aristotle, his commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and his remarkable work on the relations of the sciences to theology, entitled "*Reductio Artium Liberalium ad Theologiam.*" Of his most important works, the "*Centiloquium*" and "*Breviloquium,*" *Gerson* pronounced the latter a rich and complete exposition of dogmatics, and recommended it to beginners in theology as well adapted to kindle love in the heart and illumine the intellect. Like the work of Creation, it is divided into six parts. The introduction is a discourse on Holy Writ, its origin, contents, and interpretation. The Trinity, Creation, the Fall of Man, the Incarnation of the Word, Redemption, Grace, the Sacraments, and Eschatology, or the last things of man, form the subject-matter of the body of the work.

---

[1] Commentaries on the Sentences of the Lombard and on the Holy Scriptures; especially his Breviloquium (*ed. *Hefele*, Tüb. ed. III., 1861, with the Itinerarium mentis); Centiloquium; reductio artium ad Theol.; de VII. gradib. contemplationis, itinerarium mentis ad Deum; Vita St. Francisci, Opp., Rom. 1588; Lugd. 1688, 8 T. f.; Ven. 1751, 13 T., 4to; ed. *Peltier*, Besançon and Paris, 1861 sq. *Bertheaumier*, Hist. of St. Bonaventure, transl. from the French into German, Ratisbon, 1863. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 880 sq.— Last ed. opp. omnia, Paris, 1864, 15 vols. 4to; another ed., after a new plan of arrangement, announced, Turin, 1875. (Tr.)

The arrangement followed in the above-named works is wholly new, the *plan of each being different*, and neither like that pursued by Peter Lombard.

To these scientific labors Bonaventure added others for the advancement of the general good of the Church. Elected General of his Order when thirty-four years of age, he was created cardinal in 1273, by Pope Gregory X., who was desirous of securing his services in the important affairs of the Church. Bonaventure accompanied the Pope to the Ecumenical Council of Lyons, where he died, July 14, 1274, in the thick of his labors and the prime of his life. The deep and sincere expressions of sorrow to which every member of the council gave free vent, and the splendid funeral solemnities over his deceased body, were but the fitting crown of so pure and holy a life. The Cardinal of Ostia pronounced the funeral oration, and the Pope, the kings, and all the members of the council followed his remains to their last resting-place. He was canonized by Sixtus IV. in 1482, and, in 1587, ranked by Sixtus V. as the sixth of the Great Doctors of the Church.

Thomas, Count of Aquino,[1] was born in the year 1227,[2] in the castle of Rocca Secca, overlooking the town of Aquino, in the Campagna Felice, in the ancient Terra di Lavoro.[3] When but five years of age, he was intrusted by his noble parents, Landulf and Theodora, to the Benedictines of Monte Cassino to be educated. After remaining six years here, his studies had so far progressed that he was fit to enter the university, and he was accordingly sent to Naples, then a flourishing seat of learning. Here he studied rhetoric and logic under Peter Martin, and natural philosophy under Peter the Hibernian. He completed his studies at Naples, in 1243, with distinguished success, and preserved, during his six years' stay, amid the general depravity of a licentious university life, his original innocence and unaffected piety. The accomplished young nobleman, in whose veins coursed the blood of the Caesars, through his grandmother, Francisca, the sister of Frederic Barbarossa, sickening of the strife and abomination of the world, and longing to withdraw from it and give his soul to God, resolved, without returning to his parental roof, to enter the Order of St. Dominic, of which *Albertus Magnus*, whose fame had already filled all Europe, was then a member. Thomas entirely disregarded the claims of flesh and blood, because he felt it to be his duty to obey a higher call. His mother, Theodora, hastened to Naples on receiving information of her son's action; but the Dominicans, fearing the issue of a meeting between the two, hastily sent Thomas away to the convent of Sta. Sabina, in Rome. She at once set out for Rome, but was again baffled of seeing her son, who had been put on his way to Paris before her arrival. Indignant at this treatment, she conjured her two other sons, then serving in the army of the Emperor Frederic II., as they valued a mother's blessing, to secure and bring back Thomas. Strange to say, they were successful in capturing the young fugitive, whom they conducted to Rocca Secca, where his mother and sisters constantly besought him to withdraw from the Mendicant Order. But no entreaties could induce him either to consent to their wishes or even to lay aside his habit. His sisters, whom he converted from a frivolous way of life, assisted him in getting books from the Dominicans, and during his confinement, which lasted eighteen months, he spent his time in studying the Bible and the works of Peter Lombard. In the year 1245, during an interval of peace, his two brothers returned to Rocca Secca and brought matters to a crisis. Not content with tearing his habit from his back, they introduced into his presence a notorious courtesan, in the hope of undermining his purity and thus breaking his resolution. No sooner had she commenced to practise her licentious arts upon him than the young hero, seizing a brand from the fire-place, drove her before him out of the room. It was at this time that his loins were girt about with a white cord by two angels, at once the symbol of purity and token of its inviolability; and, from this time forth, he was free from all lustful solicitations of the flesh. Even his mother resented this unnatural mode of persecution, and assisted, herself, in securing his escape, by letting him down, in a basket, from the window of his apartment. Reaching the ground, he was received by some Dominicans in waiting for him, by whom he was conducted to Naples, where he at once made his religious profession. He was next brought before a General Chapter of the Order at Rome, and, by its instructions, sent to Cologne to pursue his studies under Albert the Great. He was here grave, taciturn, and modest to a degree that excited the merriment of his companions, who assailed him with all sorts of raillery, bestowing on him, among other epithets, that of the "*dumb Sicilian ox.*" His genuine piety, quiet and unobtrusive habits, did not conceal from his master his talents and ability, to which occasion was soon given for brilliant display. In an academical disputation, in which Thomas took part, he achieved so brilliant a success that, at the close of it, Albert the Great cried out: "We call him the *dumb ox*, but he will yet turn out a teacher whose voice will be heard through the whole world." Though such praise might have been too much for the humility of most young men, it was harmless to Thomas, who was a stranger to pride. In the same year (1245), both Albert and Thomas set out for Paris—the former to receive his doctor's degree, the latter to complete his studies. In 1248, both returned to Cologne, where Thomas became Master of Studies, and assisted Albert in his lectures. He lectured on philosophy, Sacred Scripture, and the Sentences of the Lombard, and, at that early day, commenced his commentaries on the last-named work. He was again sent to Paris in 1251, took the bachelor's degree, and, although under the required age, received a license to profess theology from the rector of the university. While explaining the Sentences, he wrote, or rather dictated, some of his lesser works. After having, at Anagni, before Pope Alexander IV., in 1255, triumphantly defended the right of the Mendicant Orders to teach and to preach, which was denied them by their virulent enemy, William of St. Amour, and defended the same right in a work entitled "*Clypeus Potestatis Ecclesiasticae,*" he returned to Paris, and in 1256, with his friend St. Bonaventure, took the doctor's degree in theology. He now devoted himself to writing and teaching until 1261, when he was called to Rome by Pope Urban IV., who desired to confer upon him ecclesiastical honors and raise him to the rank of cardinal; but these dignities were steadfastly refused by Thomas, who preferred to live and die a simple brother. He, however, consented to accept the office of "*Magister S. Palatii*," which kept him constantly about the Pope's person. In 1263 he was called to London to attend a General Chapter of the Order, convened to enforce discipline.

---

[1] The Life and Labors of *St. Thomas of Aquino*, by the Very Rev. *Roger Bede Vaughan*, O. S. B., in two vols., London, 1871–72. (Tr.)

[2] The year of his birth is given by the best authorities as 1227. *Vaughan*, l. c., p. 5. (Tr.)

[3] Not in Calabria, as both the German and French editions have it. See also *Vaughan*, l. c., p. 5. (Tr.)

In the short space of three or four years, and in the midst of many and pressing labors, Thomas had written, besides other works, the "*Catena Aurea*," "*Contra Errores Graecorum*," the *office* for the *Feast of Corpus Christi*, "*De Trinitate*," "*De Unitate Intellectus*," and the "*Commentaries on Aristotle*."

Clement IV., who succeeded Pope Urban IV. on the papal throne, in 1264, forced upon Thomas the archbishopric of Naples, but the latter was so averse to receiving so high a dignity that Clement consented to accept his resignation, thus giving him an opportunity to devote himself entirely to study. He spent the year 1265 at Rome, where he commenced the "*Summa Theologica*," the crowning work of his life, upon which he was constantly engaged, as far as his other duties permitted, until the day of his death. The first part of this work appeared in 1267 at Bologna, where he spent three years. In 1269 he went to Paris to attend a General Chapter, and, while there, was persuaded by King Louis the Saint to take a professor's chair in the monastery of St. James. During the two years spent here he continued the *Summa* and wrote several lesser works. The universities of Paris, Bologna, and Naples were each desirous of securing the services of the *Prince of Theologians*, but the General Chapter decided that he should go to Naples (1272). The King, the whole city, and the inhabitants of the surrounding country turned out to receive him, and his entrance resembled more the triumph of a conqueror than homage paid to the sanctity and learning of a humble monk.

The translation of the works of Aristotle from the original Greek text, commenced in 1270, was now continued, and portions of the third part of the *Summa* written. The labors of St. Thomas were now rapidly drawing to a close. In the last months of the year 1273, he frequently swooned away and went into ecstasies; and on the 6th of December of the same year, he wrote the ninetieth question of the third part, and here ended his work on the *Summa*. The remaining days of his life were given chiefly to the preparation for death, which soon followed. Gregory X. had convoked an ecumenical council to convene at Lyons, May 1, 1274, and, on account of the importance of the questions to come up for discussion, particularly those relating to the Greek Church, desired the presence of the *Angelic Doctor*. Thomas, though feeble in health, complied with the Pope's wishes, and set out on his journey in January, but was able to go no farther than *Fossanuova*, where he took shelter in the Cistercian abbey. Here he died, March 7, 1274, in the forty-eighth year of his age. Before receiving Holy Viaticum he gave expression to these words of faith and love: "I receive Thee, who hast paid the price of my soul's redemption, for love of whom I have sacrificed myself, have watched and toiled. Thee have I preached, Thee have I taught, never have said aught against Thee. If perchance any word of mine in relation to the Most Blessed Sacrament may have been unadvisedly spoken, I submit such for correction to the Roman Church, in whose obedience I depart this life." He was at once recognized as a saint, and canonized in 1323 by Pope John XXII. He was buried in the monastery of Toulouse, but one of his arms was sent to that of St. James, at Paris. Pius V. solemnly declared him a *Doctor of the Church* in 1567. Pope John XXII. said of him that he wrought as many miracles as he wrote articles; that he had shed more light upon the teachings of the Church than all the other doctors combined, and that one could learn more by studying his works for a year than by studying those of all the others for a lifetime. His intimate friend, Raynald of Piperno, testified that he had always found him as innocent as a child; and this purity of heart was visible in his every look and word and act, and merited for him the title of *Doctor Angelicus*. He is also sometimes called the *Eagle*, and sometimes *Doctor Eucharisticus*. "He was," says *William de*

Thou, his principal biographer, "unaffectedly humble, perfectly pure in mind and body, devout in prayer, prudent in judgment, possessed of a retentive memory, and, having his thoughts continuously fixed on things above, took little account of the things of earth."[1]

Having taken a rapid glance at his life, it still remains to say a few words of the scientific and historic importance of the work accomplished by him. He was not only the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, but may fairly claim the first place among the most eminent the Church has ever produced—not so much for the extent of his knowledge as for the depth, acuteness, and wide philosophic reach of his mind. He was preëminently speculative and dialectical, and withal a true *mystic.* His fundamental principle was that we should strive to know and love what is *above us*—i. e., God and things divine; and that we should make a rational use of what is *below us*—i. e., nature and things created, to the end that, love being thus enkindled in the heart, our thoughts might rise in gratitude to the Giver of every good and perfect gift. The seeking after knowledge (*studium sapientiae*) he held to be *the highest, the most perfect, the most useful,* and *the most pleasurable* pursuit that could engage the mind of man; because, having in it something of a divine character, it is the source of a pure joy that leaves no after-taste of earth. Of his three principal theological works—viz., "*Libb. IV. de veritate Catholicae fidei*

---

[1] *Guilielm. de Thoco,* Vita, V. 24.

[2] Memorable indeed is the sentence pronounced by Pope John XXII.: "*Tolle Thomam et dissipabo ecclesiam!*" Opp. cura Justiniani et Mariquez, Romae, 1570, 17 T. fol.; Antv. 1617, 18 T. f.; Paris, 1660, 28 T. f.; Venet. 1745 sq., 28 T. 4to. The Par. edit. contains: Commentaries on the writings of Aristotle (T. 1–6); on the Sentences of the Lombard (T. 7–10); Quaestiones quodlibetales (T. 11); Quaestiones disputatae (T. 12); Summa contra Gentiles (T. 13, 14). Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament (T. 15-18); *Summa Theologica* (T. 21–23). Most recently published by *Ferrari,* Opuscula inedita, Leodiis, 1842. [S. Thomae Aquinatis, Doctoris Angelici, O. P. Opera omnia ad fidem optimarum editionum accurate recognita, T. XXIV. in 4to. *Parmae,* typis *Fiaccadori,* 1852–69. By the same publisher, Summa Theologica, in 14 vols. 12mo, 1852-57; Summa Philosophica, 3 vols. 12mo, 1855. Magnificent ed. of Ang. Doct. S. Thomae Aq. Sum. Theol. cum Comment. Thomae de Vio Cardin. *Cajetani,* et elucid. litt. P. Seraph. Cap. a Porrecta O. P., 10 vols. fol. Romae, 1773. Pocket ed. by L. Vivès, 9 vols. 16mo. Formalis Explicatio Summae Theol. S. Thom. Aq. Doct. Ang. auct. Fr. Hieronymo *de Medicis* a

contra Gentiles," "*Commentum in IV. libros sententiar. Petr. Lomb.*," and "*Summa totius theologiae tripartita*"—the last, the greatest production of his mind, remained unfinished. A portion of the third part was compiled from his lectures, the rest supplied from his commentaries on the Lombard by de Rubeis. In the exposition of his system in this work, assuredly the most important production of the schoolmen, St. Thomas professedly follows St. Augustine, of whom, according to Cardinal *Noris*, a perfectly competent judge in such matters, *he is the best commentator.* Still, it is quite evident that Hugh of St. Victor, whom he also regarded as his master, exercised no little influence in directing the tendency of the Angelic Doctor's mind. It has been erroneously stated that the great *Summa* was not published by St. Thomas himself, but compiled from his lectures after his death. This is true only of the third part.[1]

The work is divided into three parts.[2] The first treats of

Camerino, T. X., Vici (Vich, in Spain), 1858–62; Summa S. Thomae hod. acad. mor. accommodata, *Billuart*, T. X., Paris, 1857. Philosophia juxta D. Thomae dogmata, *Goudin*, O. P., T. IV., Parisiis, 1851, and Urbeveteri, 1859–60.—Tr.] Conf. *Bolland*, Act. SS. mens. Mart., T. I., p. 655. Vie de St. Thomas Aquin., *A. Touron*, 1737, 4to. †*Jgn. Feigerle*, Hist. vitae SS. Thomae a Villanova, Thomae Aquin. et Laurent. Justiniani, Vienn. 1839, and *Mattes*, in the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, Vol. X., p. 911–930. †* *Werner*, St. Thomas of Aquin, Ratisbon, 1868 sq., 3 vols. **Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 421–734. *Plassmann*, The School of St. Thomas, Soest, 1857 sq., 5 vols. †*Oischinger*, The Speculative Theology of St. Thomas of Aquino, Landshut, 1858. *Ueberweg*, p. 189–201. *Vaughan*, The Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin, 2 vols., London, 1871–72.

[1] Cf. *Natal. Alex.* dissert. ad h. e. XIII. and XIV., saeculi, diss. VI., and *Oudinus*, l. c., T. III., p. 353 sq.

[2] The *Summa* is divided into three main parts, of which the second is subdivided into the Prima Secundae and Secunda Secundae. The first part establishes the claim of theology to be regarded as a science capable of demonstrative proof, to which every other science is auxiliary, and proceeds to treat of the Divine Nature, Providence, and Predestination; the creation, visible and invisible; and human nature in relation to the general scheme. The second part, in its first section, considers man as a moral being, and as the recipient of divine grace; involving the questions of free-will, original sin, and justification. Justification consists of three particulars: 1. Remission of sins; 2. Infusion of grace; 3. Faith that moves the soul toward God as the author of justification, and is "informis" as yet—aversion from sin being the spontaneous act of recovered freedom of will. Justification is thus a movement "de contrario in contrarium," a transmutation "de statu injustitiae ad statum justitiae." The second

God, the second of *man*, and the third of the *Godman*. The second part has two divisions—the *Prima Secundae*, which is a general treatise on the virtues and vices (*De virtutibus et vitiis in genere*), and the *Secunda Secundae*, which is a special treatise on the virtues and vices in detail. Heretofore, dogmatics and morals had always been combined in treatment by schoolmen,[1] with perhaps the exception of Abelard, who, however, regarded ethics more from a philosophical than from a Christian and theological point of view.

The method of exposition followed throughout the *Summa* is that of questions. First, after the statement of the question, the *doctrinal errors against it* are given briefly, but comprehensively, in a series of objections; next, a *summary argument*, introduced by "*Sed contra*," based on either reason or

---

section is the complement of the former, and is the most important of the entire work, as a grand exposition of Christian ethics. It analyzes the complex elements of man's moral nature in a manner worthy of his great master Aristotle; grouping the virtues as theological and ethical, as infused and acquired—the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit: the theological virtues being Faith, Hope, and Charity; the ethical comprising the cardinal virtues—Justice, Prudence, Fortitude, Temperance. The third part deals with the doctrines of the Incarnation and the seven Sacraments of the Church—two subjects that are inseparable from each other; the Eucharist conveying the very substance of Christ to the faithful communicant; the rest, in a subordinate degree, exhibiting a participation of His grace in varying mode. An analogy is marked out (between the wants of the corporal and spiritual life of man, and—Tr.) between the seven virtues and the Sacraments, each member in the one system being the correlative of something similar in the other. Thus baptism, as the remedy of original sin, corresponds with Faith; extreme unction, as the remission of venial sin, with Hope; the Holy Eucharist, as removing the penal consequences of transgression, with Charity. And so, with respect to the other virtues, prudence is represented by Holy Orders as the remedy of ignorance; justice or righteousness by penance, the supplemental safeguard of contrition and the ordained means of obtaining remission of deadlier sins; temperance by matrimony, as a check to inordinate desire; fortitude by confirmation, as the remedy of weakness. The Summa concludes by comparing the two main phases of religious life—the contemplative and the active; and, while under the guidance of Aristotle the former is preferred, an ecclesiastical direction is given to the preference, and the monastic life is shown to be of all the most perfect. This truly great work has done more than any other to fix the exact meaning of theological terms. *Blunt's* Dictionary of Sects and Heresies, art. Schoolmen. (Tr.)

[1] †*Rietter*, The Morals of St. Thomas of Aquino, Munich, 1858; in *Plassmann*, Vol. IV.

authority, or both, directly refutes the erroneous principle underlying the objections; then follows the *body of the article*, embodying the true teaching and the reason for it, as warranted by the argument advanced in the "*Sed contra*" paragraph; finally, the doctrinal errors in the order of the objections are taken up and answered in detail. Such is the structure of every "*article*" throughout the *Summa*. Conclusions are drawn with the utmost precision and logical rigor; all the parts are adjusted with admirable completeness and harmony; and, while every question is exhaustively treated, there is never a word too many.

The first question of the first part establishes the claim of theology to be regarded as a *science*, and capable of all the conditions of demonstrative proof, because historical facts, on which it is based, are themselves but the expressions and exponents of *ideas*. Again, theology being the science of God, and deriving its first principles from *Divine Revelation*, has a positive character, distinguishing it from philosophy and all other human sciences, which are its handmaids.

St. Thomas remarks that in controversies with *infidels* (*infideles*), one must start by showing that their objections are not well taken; but with heretics the case is different. Since these admit certain doctrines and deny others, one of the former must be taken as common ground, on which both parties may stand; and, starting here, the Catholic controversialist must show the logical inconsistency of his opponent's position by demonstrating the intrinsic and essential connection of the challenged doctrine with the whole deposit of faith. Such is the line of argument St. Thomas himself pursues in *an apologetical work*, entitled the *Lesser* or *Philosophical Summa*,[1] and written at the earnest request of Raymond of Pennafort. It was designed to serve as a guide to preachers in Spain in their discussions with *Mohammedans* and *Jews*, and is nearly, if not quite, equal in merit to the "*Theological Summa.*" On the respective merits of these two great works, the opinions of two Protestant authors may be quoted. Of the "*Theological Summa,*" *Mr. Milman*[1] says: "It would, as might seem, occupy a whole life of the most secluded study to write, almost to read." "If penetration of thought," says the Anglican Bishop *Hampden,*[2] "comprehensiveness of view, exactness the most minute, an ardor of inquiry the most keen, a patience of pursuit the most unwearied, are among the merits of a philosopher, then may Thomas Aquinas dispute even the *first* place among the candidates for supremacy in speculative science."

---

[1] De veritate cath. fid. ctr. Gentiles, libb. IV., cap. II., the author thus states the scope of his work: "Inter omnia vero studia hominum, sapientiae studium est perfectius, sublimius et utilius et jucundius. —— Primo, quia non ita sunt nobis nota singulorum errantium dicta sacrilega, ut ex his, quae dicunt, possimus rationes assumere ad eorum errores destruendos. Hoc modo usi sunt antiqui doctores in destructionem errorum Gentilium, quorum positiones scire poterant, quia et ipsi Gentiles fuerant, vel saltem inter Gentiles conversati et in eorum doctrinis eruditi. Secundo, quia quidam eorum, ut Mahometistae et Pagani, non conveniunt nobiscum in autoritate alicujus scripturae, per quam possint convinci, sicut contra Judaeos disputare possumus per vetus testa-

The philosophical world also owes St. Thomas a debt of gratitude for his translation of Aristotle's works and his admirable commentaries on the same. He was a *realist* in the proper sense of the word, and did more than any other writer to clear up the difficulties between Realism and Nomalism. Universals, according to him, were but abstractions of the mind, having no existence outside the intellect, and possessing no objective reality apart from the individual objects in which they reside.[3]

His *commentaries* on the Holy Scriptures give evidence of an intimate acquaintance with the Fathers, and of a thorough knowledge of the fundamental ideas of the Bible and of the Christian dogmas. In his work "*De Regimine Principum*" he gives a complete exposition and defense of the *theory of Christian government and political economy* as understood in the

---

mentum, contra haereticos per novum: hi vero neutrum recipiunt, *unde necesse est, ad naturalem rationem recurrere, cui omnes assentire cogunter, quae tamen in rebus divinis deficiens est.* Simul autem veritatem aliquam investigantes ostendemus, qui errores per eam excludantur, et quomodo demonstrativa veritas fidei Christianae religionis concordet."

[1] Lat. Chr. VI., p. 451. (Tr.)

[2] *Encycl. Metrop.* XI. 793.

[3] Universalia non sunt res subsistentes, sed habent esse solum in singularibus, *Contra Gent.*, Lib. I., c. 65. Quod est commune multis, non est aliquid praeter multa, nisi sola ratione, *ibid.*, c. 26.

Middle Ages.[1] Finally, his incomparable *hymns* on the Eucharist, breathing a heavenly inspiration, and, in fact, every portion of his admirable *Office* for the Octave of Corpus Christi, have made his name dear to all believers in the Real Presence, and have enshrined his memory forever in their hearts.

The ablest of the disciples of St. Thomas were *Giles of Colonna*, a Roman, called *Doctor Fundatissimus* († 1316), and *Hervaeus Natalis*, the latter of whom eventually became General of the Dominican Order and Rector of the University of Paris († 1323).

The fame of St. Thomas, and the almost paramount influence exercised by the school of theology of which he was the founder, excited the jealousy and called forth the energy of the Franciscans. They finally produced a rival to the illustrious Dominican in *John Duns Scotus*,[2] born at Dunstan, in Northumbria, in 1266 (not, as is frequently stated, in 1274). Trithemius says he was one of the disciples of Alexander of Hales, but this is evidently a mistake, as the latter died in 1245. While professor at Oxford, Paris, and Cologne, he earned for himself the title of the *Subtile Doctor* (*Doctor Subtilis*). He died in 1308, while still in the prime of life and the full vigor of his mental powers.

There was some justification in the Franciscans setting him up as an opponent to Thomas Aquinas; for, though inferior to the latter in speculative genius, he is his equal in dialectical skill and his superior in acuteness. From his method of stating the most important arguments for and against a proposition, and leaving his hearers to draw their own conclusions, his opponents styled him "*Quodlibetarius.*" Besides giving a fresh impulse to Realism, he anticipated the inductive method of Bacon and Newton, and thus forms a connecting link between the ancient and modern schools of philosophy. His very refinement and subtlety of reasoning and the obscurity of his language make an intelligent perusal of his works a tiresome and difficult task.

---

[1] De regimine principum, libb. IV. (opusculum XX.), in the ed. altera Veneta, T. XIX. Cf. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 721–733; *Contzen*, Thomas of Aquin as a writer on Political Economy, Lps. 1861, and revised art. in "*Christlich-Sociale Blätter*," Lps. 1870, nro. 10. *Thoemes*, Divi Thomae Aquinatis opera et praecepta quid valeant ad res ecclesiastico-politicas, sociales, Berolini, 1875, Pars I. Of the same nature as "De Reg. Princ." is the work of *Peraldus* († 1260), entitled "The Duties of the Nobility," in seven books (especially Book VII.), translated from the Latin into German, and prefaced by Bishop *Ketteler* of Mentz, ibid., 1868.

[2] Opp. ed. *Wadding*, Lugd. 1639 sq. (12 T. f.); Commentaries on Aristotle (T. 1–4); Quaestiones in libb. IV. sentent. (T. 5–10); Reportata Parisiensia (T. 12); Quaest. quodlibet. (T. 12.) *Döllinger*, in the *Freiburg Cyclop.*, Vol. IX., p. 878–881; Fr. tr., Vol. 21, p. 401–406. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 778–868. *Ueberweg*, p. 202–207.

From Scotus dates the commencement of the rivalry between the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*, which gradually assumed so much the spirit of a partisan warfare that one could not belong to either of the two Orders without, by this very fact, professing either Thomism or Scotism. One of the most distinguished representatives of the latter school was *Francis de Mayronis*. He died at Piacenza, in 1325. *The philosophical controversy between the two schools*[1] turned, as might have been anticipated, on *universals*. The results of the long and acrimonious contest were important and momentous. As the formula of *Realism* had been "*Universalia ante res*," that of *Nominalism* "*Universalia post res*," and that of the compromise "*Universalia in rebus*," it now included something of each, and ran, "*Universalia ante, in, et post res*"—*ante res*, inasmuch as universals are in the Divine mind; *in rebus*, inasmuch as they have a real existence in the concrete; and *post res*, inasmuch as the intellect, by abstraction from individual objects, obtains a true conception of them.

In the matter of sin and *grace*, Thomas and the Dominicans closely adhered to the theory of St. Augustine, excepting in so far as they smoothed down the harsher and more repulsive features of his doctrine and ascribed to man a power of meriting which the Great Doctor would never have conceded. Scotus and the Franciscans, on the other hand, took a milder view, affirming that, even after the Fall, man retained sufficient strength to achieve his first "*meritum de congruo.*" They held, moreover, that original sin was inseparably connected with the finite, and that grace is the naturally ordained means to the development of the spiritual life. The gift of grace, they said, was dependent on predestination, and this, again, on prescience.

---

[1] *Arada*, Controv. theol. inter Thom. et Scot., Col. 1620, 4to. *Fr. a St. Augustino Macedo*, Collationes doctrinae St. Thom. et Scoti cum differentiis inter utrumque, Patav. 1671. *Bulaei*, Hist. Univers. Paris, T. IV., p. 298 sq.

Again, while St. Thomas held that the death of Christ is not only a sufficient, but also an infinite satisfaction (*satisfactio non solum sufficiens sed superabundans*), by reason of the infinite worth of the life offered up (*vita Dei et hominis*), Scotus taught that as the sufferings of Christ were the sufferings of His human nature, they had consequently only a finite merit; that God *accepted* them as the price of the sins of mankind, though in value they were in no way adequate to the purchase, and that their worth was given to them only by the gratuitous acceptance (*acceptatio gratuita*) of them by the Father. Such was the *acceptation* theory of Scotus, according to which Christ died only for the sake of truth and justice, and to carry out the divine plan of mercy.

As regards the *Real Presence*, *Scotus* held that Christ's glorified body was locally translated or introduced (*per adductionem* or *introductionem*) into the substanceless accidents; while Thomas, on the other hand, taught that in the Real Presence the very substance of the bread and wine was changed into the Body and Blood of Christ (*transsubstantiatio*).[1] Finally, the Dominicans denied and the Franciscans warmly defended the *Immaculate Conception* of the Blessed Virgin Mary, while the members of each Order believed that their respective teaching was better calculated than that of their opponents to promote the honor of the Mother of God.[2]

---

[1] In the German text, *Alzog* has ascribed to Scotus the teaching of Thomas and vice versa on the Real Presence. This is evident from what Thomas says in the *Summa* (Part Third, q. lxxv., art. 2, in Corp.): "Non potest aliquid esse alicubi, ubi prius non erat, nisi per loci mutationem, vel per alterius conversionem in idipsum. Manifestum est autem quod Corpus Christi non incipit esse in hoc sacramento per motum localem; primo quidem, quia sequeretur quod desineret esse in coelo: non enim quod localiter movetur, pervenit de novo ad aliquem locum nisi deserat priorem; secundo, quia omne corpus localiter motum pertransit omnia media, quod hic dici non potest; tertio, quia impossibile est quod unus motus ejusdem corporis localiter moti terminetur simul ad diversa loca, cum tamen in pluribus locis Corpus Christi, sub hoc sacramento simul esse incipiat. Et ideo relinquitur quod non possit aliter corpus Christi incipere esse de novo in hoc sacramento nisi per *conversionem* substantiae panis in ipsum." (Tr.)

[2] The points controverted between the *Thomists* and the *Scotists* are stated by

This rivalry, though not unfrequently carried on with acrimonious bitterness, stimulated a desire for study, caused investigations to be made on various questions of theology, tended to make controversialists tolerant of each other's opinions, and in this way was turned to the profit of the Church.

Another of the great men of the thirteenth century was *Roger Bacon*, a Franciscan, who, born at Ilchester, in Somersetshire, in 1214, studied at Oxford under the patronage of Robert Greathead, Bishop of Lincoln, and became afterward professor at the same university, where his unusual attainments obtained for him the title "*The Wonderful Doctor*" (*Doctor Mirabilis*), and where he died, June 11, 1294. Like *Albertus Magnus*, he was conversant with every branch of human knowledge, but was especially distinguished by his great facility of conception and his extraordinary proficiency in the *natural sciences*. In his "*Opus Majus*," dedicated to Pope Clement IV., he endeavored to give a new direction to Scholasticism and to widen the scope of natural philoso-

---

Avancini, S. J., in his beautiful Dialogus Thomistae et Scotistae, Ode XVII., De immac. conc. B. M. V., from which the following two stanzas are taken:

SCOTIST.	THOMIST.
Hic te non colit, o sidere pulchrior	Hic te virgo minus diligit, a tui
Unquam virgo satis, qui tibi defluam	Qui nati pretio sanguinis eximit;
Adae in posteritatem	Non vult esse redemptam,
Appingit maculam patris.	Qui peccasse negaverit.

Remark.—It is very generally asserted that St. Thomas opposed the Immaculate Conception. This opinion is based on what he says in the *Summa* (Part Third, q. xxvii., art. 2): "Ante infusionem animae rationalis beata Virgo sanctificata non fuit." That St. Thomas positively taught the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception may be proved from many passages of his writings. For example, he says (Ep. ad Gal., c. 3, lect. 6): "*Mulierem autem ex omnibus non inveni quae peccato omnino immunis esset, ad minus originali vel veniali. Excipitur purissima et omni laude dignissima Virgo Maria.*" Again (Lib. I. Sent., dist. 44, q. i., art. 3, ad 3): "*Talis fuit puritas Beatae Virginis, quae a peccato originali et actuali immunis fuit.*" And the Dominican, *Bromiard* (in Summa Praedicantium, v. *Maria*, art. 2, nro. 10), scrupled not to assert concerning S. Thom., 3 pt., q. 27, art 2, ponit ejus (Mariae) sanctificationis excellentiam, quantum ad temporis prioritatem in hoc, quod sanctificata fuit *in* sui animatione—i. e., in conjunctione animae cum corpore in utero matris suae; quod significat, says *Card. Gaudé*, Mariam fuisse immaculatam *in suo conceptu passivo*—i. e., animam ejus, gratia sanctificante praeventam, fuisse a peccato originali immunem. (Tr.)

phy.[1] Like his countryman, *John of Salisbury*, he complained that Scholasticism was too narrow, one-sided, and conservative. An independent thinker, he protested against an unreflecting surrender of one's judgment to the authority of the Fathers and to the prescriptions of custom; advocated a more sparing use of syllogistic forms and a more frequent recourse to experiments and the inductive method; and, while making little account of the investigations of Greek antiquity, recommended solid and critical linguistic studies. He was also in favor of having history, and especially Church history,[2] more generally studied, and on this point was of one mind with *Vincent of Beauvais*, the great compiler and cyclopaedist of his age.

Raymundus Lullus, born on the island of Majorca, 1236, living in the world until the age of thirty, and leading, as a young man, a life of questionable morality, but finally converted, and devoting himself chiefly to the conversion of the Saracens, in the pursuit of which he made some voyages to Africa, during one of which he was set upon and tortured by the Mohammedans of the town of Bugia, June 30, 1315, like so many more men of those times, was desirous of giving a new direction to scientific studies. His "*Ars universalis scientiarum*," a kind of mathematico-logical work, which, he promised, would be productive of greater results than Scholasticism, and be more rigorous in method, was, on the contrary, still more complicated and abstruse, and not a little perilous to the faith of the Church. It was precisely these characteristics that recommended it to many,[1] who, like *Lullus* himself,[2] were active, restless, and constantly in search of some novelty. But preposterous works like the "*Ars universalis*" exercised little influence in hastening the decline of mediaeval theology, when compared with the shock it received from the separation of the philosophical from the theological faculty of Paris in 1270.

---

[1] Opus maj. (1266) ed. Sam. Jebb., Lond. 1733; Ven. 1750 f. As something heretofore unpublished, *Dr. J. S. Brewer* added Opus tertium in compendium philosophiae, Lond. 1863, in 3 T. Compare the Collection of remarkable biographies, Halle, 1757, Pt. IV., p. 616–709. *Alex. v. Humboldt*, Cosmos, Vol. II., p. 284. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 915–924.

[2] "Historias ecclesiasticas (quo lacte pascebatur antiquorum simplicitas) viluisse et in neglectum venisse, cum tamen non solum utique voluptatis ac recreationis spiritum, verum etiam aedificationis plurimum in se contineant." *Vincent. Bellovacens.* Speculum majus s. imago mundi (Spec. naturale, doctrinale, historiale; Spec. morale attributed to the same), ed. prim., Argentor. 1473 sq.; ed. opt., Duac. 1624, 4 T. fol. Cf. *Vogel*, Literary and Historical Notice of Vincent of Beauvais, *Freiburg* Journal of Theology, Vol. X., and *Schlosser*, Vincent of Beauvais on the Education of Princes, Frankfort, 1819, 2 vols. *Boutaric*, Vincent de Beauvais et la Science de l'Antiquité Classique au XIIIième Siècle (Revue des questions historiques, T. VIII., livr. 1, Janv. 1875).

§ 258. *The Other Sciences—Religious Poets—National Literature.*

Besides the treatises on morals by *Abelard* and *St. Thomas*, already mentioned, the works of *William Peraldus*,[3] *Raymond of Pennafort*,[4] and the "*Speculum morale*," attributed to *Vincent of Beauvais*, should be noticed. Raymond systematized the old penance-books, and may be said to have been the founder of *Casuistry*, or the method of applying general laws and rules of duty and conduct to particular cases. The practical activity of the mystics was perhaps more efficacious for good in the domain of morals than in science, inasmuch as their own lives were an illustration of the principles of a pure and severe morality.

As regards learned and scientific *interpretations of Holy Scripture*, apart from being based only on the translation of the Vulgate text, they occupied, relatively, too small a space in the studies of these times. The "*Glossa ordinaria*" of Walafried Strabo, which obtained a wide circulation, was supplemented by a similar work from the pen of *Anselm of Laon* († 1117).[5] A fresh impulse was given to biblical studies by the publication of the *Didascalion* of Hugh of St. Victor, in the first part of which he gives a sort of methodology of the philosophical sciences, and, in the second, an historical introduction to the Holy Scriptures and an abridgment of hermeneutics, containing rules for the direction of those commenting on the Sacred Text, which he himself follows. *Stephen*, Abbot of Citeaux, corrected the Vulgate according to the best manuscripts, and by comparison with the Hebrew text. *Hugh à Sancto Caro*,[1] a Dominican, who was created cardinal in 1244 and died in 1260, *also emended the Vulgate*, divided all the books into chapters, arranged the first *Concordance* according to *this* division, and wrote commentaries on the text. "*The Expositio continua in quatuor Evangelia*" of St. Thomas, which, by excellence styled "*Catena aurea*," soon superseded all other commentaries,[2] made him a great authority as an interpreter of Holy Writ. Of these works a Protestant theologian of our own day has expressed the following opinion:[3] "We have a marvelous proof in his (St. Thomas') writings, so famous during the Middle Ages, how the sense and idea of Holy Writ may become clear to studious and penetrating minds, even without the aids and appliances we now possess." *Roger Bacon* earnestly recommended to his contemporaries the study of the Holy Scriptures in their original language, a branch in which the *Spanish Jews* had already made considerable progress. Among the most distinguished of these latter were *Salomon Jarchi* († 1170), *Aben Esra* of Toledo († 1167), *David Kimchi* of Narbonne († c. 1230),

---

[1] The works of *Raymundus Lullus* appeared, in part, at Mentz, 1721–1742, in 10 vols. fol.; yet there are wanting, between them, volumes 7 and 8, which are found nowhere, and which (for the want of approbation) were probably never printed. Cf. the *Freiburg Cyclop.*, Vol. VI., p. 638 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 13, p. 510–513; and *Helfferich*, Raymundus Lullus and the Beginning of Catalonian Literature, Berlin, 1858. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 924–952.

[2] See below, § 264.

[3] Summa de virtutibus et vitiis, last ed., Paris, 1629, 4to.

[4] Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio, generally "Summa Raymundiana; often published c. glossis Joannis de Friburgo, Rom. 1603 fol.

[5] Glossa interlinearis cum glossa ordinaria, ed. Basil. 1502 fol.; and oftener,

---

Enarrationes, in cantica canticorum, in Matthaeum et in Apocalypsin, in *Migne*, Ser. Lat., T. 162.

[1] Cf. *Quetif* and *Echard*, Scriptt. ord. Praedicat., T. I., p. 194 sq. *Hugo*, Postill. in univ. Bibl. juxta quadrupl. sensum ed. Basil. 1498; Paris, 1548, 7 V. f.; his Concordantiae sacrorum bibliorum ed., Basil. 1543 and 1551 f.

[2] Explanation of Job, of first fifty psalms, of the Canticle of Canticles, the Catena aurea of the four Gospels (Germ. trans. by *Oischinger*, Ratisbon, 1846 sq., 7 vols. Commentar. in omnes D. Pauli Ap. epistolas, ed. nova, Leodii, 1857–58, 3 T.

[3] *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Manual of the Hist. of Dogmas, p. 262. Cf. *Tholuck*, Disputatio de Thoma Aquinate atque Abaelardo interpretibus N. T., Hall. 1842. *Uster*, De medii aevi theologia exegetica, Götting. 1855. St. Thomas as interpreter of the Bible ("*Catholic*") of 1862, Vol. I., p. 342–358.

and *Moses ben Maimon* († 1205), and their eminence as biblical scholars is chiefly to be ascribed to their Arabic culture.[1]

The Mystics also applied themselves with great ardor to the study of Holy Writ, which, according to the taste of the age, they interpreted in a *fourfold sense*—viz., *literalis*, *moralis seu tropologicus*, *allegoricus*, and *anagogicus*.[2] Among the most remarkable of them is *Rupert of Deutz* († 1125), who, in forcible language, and burning with a holy zeal in the advocacy of his cause, points out to the clergy their model, as portrayed in the Sacred Text, and warns them that the same text contains their condemnation, should they fail in their duty. His admirable treatise entitled "*De victoria Dei libb. XIII.*" is at once the crown of his exegetical labors and the transition to his *apologetical* works, as, for example, "*Dialogus inter Christianum et Judaeum*" and "*De glorificatione Trinitatis*."[3] Other writers, as *Peter the Chanter* († 1197), in his "*Verbum abbreviatum*," advocated, but in vain, a more simple and literal interpretation.

The *sacred hymns* of *St. Bernard*, *St. Bonaventure*, and *St. Thomas*, and of *Celano*, *Jacopona*, and other writers of this age, are in many respects superior to any similar compositions produced either before their time or since.[4] The writers of *history* and chronicles, like *Vincent of Beauvais*, have been already referred to at pages 479 sq., and the compilers of *canon law* at pages 638 sq. We may here remark, with *Count de Montalembert*, that, notwithstanding the close relations existing between Rome and every country of Europe, poetry was never so vigorous, so national, so popular, and withal so *thoroughly*

---

[1] Cf. *Richard Simon.*, Hist. crit. des commentaires du V. T., p. 170 sq. *Wolfii* Biblioth. hebr., Vol. I.

[2] According to the well-known distich:

> "Litera gesta docet, quid credas Allegoria,
> Moralis quid agas, quo tendas Anagogia."

[3] Commentarior. lib. XXXII. in 12 Prophetas minor., in cantica canticorum libb. VII., in evang. St. Joannis libb. XIV., in apol. libb: XII. (Opp., Colon. 1526; Mogunt. 1631, 2 T. fol.; defective, pirated impression, Paris, 1638). Cf. *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclop.*, Vol. IX., p. 450–455; French transl., Vol. 20, p. 501 sq.

[4] *Mone*, Latin Hymns of the Middle Ages, Freiburg, 1853 sq., Vol. I. (to God and the Holy Angels); Vol. II. (to the B. V. M.); Vol. III. (to the Saints.) *Schlosser*, The Church in her Hymns, Mentz, 1851, 2 vols., 2 ed., Freiburg, 1863.

religious and *tender*, as during this epoch.[1] In some countries it had developed into all the rich variety and elegance of form which are generally supposed to be the peculiar and exclusive characteristics of classic antiquity and modern enlightenment.

The *Minnesaenger* (1170–1250) of Germany could boast of having among them the Emperor Henry VI., but the most eminent of these numerous bards were incontestably *Henry of Ofterdingen* and *Walther of the Vogelweide*.[2] None could throw into lofty and felicitous verse better than they popular feelings, tastes and traditions, or combine more harmoniously the noble promptings of patriotic love with the purest inspirations of religious enthusiasm. The *Nibelungen*, the Iliad of the Germans, compiled and committed to writing about the year 1210, is the best example of German epic; while in the *Gudrun*, the German Odysee, the mild and the tender are blended felicitously with the stern and the vigorous.

Wolfram of Eschenbach is the author of the *Percival*, an amplification of the legend of the Holy Grâl and Knights of the Round Table; and of the *Titurel*, a master-piece of Catholic genius, and not unworthy a place beside the *Divina Commedia*. *Gottfried of Strasburg*,[3] who, in his unfinished poem of *Tristan*

Simrock, Ancient Christian Hymns, both Latin and German, Cologne, 2 ed., 1867. *Ozanam*, The Franciscan Poets of Italy in the thirteenth century; German transl., with add. by *Julius*, Münster, 1853.

[1] *Barthel*, The Classic Period of German National Literature in the Middle Ages, Brunswick, 1857, p. 291 and oftener. *Clarus*, Review of Spanish Literature during the Middle Ages, Mentz, 1847, 2 vols. *Schack*, History of Dramat. Lit. and Art in Spain, Berlin, 1845–46.

[2] †*Görres*, The Popular Books of Germany, Heidelberg, 1807. **Simrock*, Book of Heroes, Stuttg. 1858, Vol. I. (Nibelungen); Vol. II. (Gudrun); Vol. III. (Little Book of Heroes.) By the *same*, Parcival and Titurel, being Poems of Chivalry, trans. and explained, Stuttg. 1857. *Reichl*, Studies on Wolfram's Percival, Vienna, 1858. **Pfeiffer*, German Classics of the Middle Ages, with interpretation of words and definitions, Lps. 1864–71, in 10 vols.: Walther of the Vogelweide, Gudrun, Nibelungen, Hartmann of the Aue, Gottfried of Strasburg, Wolfram of Eschenbach. By the *same*, the journal "Germania." Cf. *Wolfgang Menzel*, German Poetry from the most ancient to the most modern times, Stuttg. 1858–59, 3 vols. *Vilmar*, History of German National Literature, Marbg. 1846, in a number of editions. *Eichendorf*, Hist. of the Poet. Literature of Germany, Paderborn, 1859, in several editions. †*Lindemann*, Hist. of Germ. Literature, Freiburg (1866), 2 ed. 1869.

[3] † *Watterich*, Gottfried of Strasburg, a Singer of the Love of God, Lips. 1858.

and Isolt, sang of the pleasures of the world and sensual love, after a time turned his pen to themes more worthy of his genius, and wrote a fine hymn in praise of the Blessed Virgin, in which, when he had got on some way, he broke out in honor of the Son of God as follows: "He suffered that we might receive joy, and died that we might live. Has ever man given unto man proofs of fidelity *like* unto these?" *Conrad of Würzburg*, in his poems entitled "*Gold Smithery*," really poured out in golden verse the glowing creations of his fancy and the warm affections of a heart on fire with divine love. His verses in honor of the Virgin Mary are sweet and tender in sentiment, and inspire in the reader pure and holy aspirations.

The literature of the *Troubadours* of France, destitute of every Christian element, rarely rose above the praise of corporal beauty, and, if we except a composition here and there, was not free from the heretical taint of the South. The folk lore of the age of Charlemagne, such as the Round Table or Holy Grâl, furnished abundant material for popular *romance*.

In Spain, *Gonzalo of Berceo* composed hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin, and St. Dominic threw into verse his thoughts on the Last Judgment. *Thibaut of Navarre* sang so excellently of the glories of the Blessed Virgin and the heroic deeds of the Crusades, that his productions elicited the praise of the great *Dante*. This immortal poet, born at Florence in 1265, and died about 1321, in his *Divina Commedia*, sings of Heaven, Purgatory, and Hell, and, with a consummate skill of which no one before him or since has been master, puts into strong, stately, and sweeping verse the theology and philosophy of the Middle Ages. In him the religious poetry of Italy reached its highest excellence, and his great poem led the way to other efforts, which, though less meritorious, are still the honor and boast of that land of illustrious bards.

It is worthy of remark here that even so great a genius as Dante is partly indebted for his inspiration, and for not a few of his thoughts, to the "*Book of Spiritual Graces*,"[1] written by the German nun, *St. Mechtilde of Helfeda* (*la Matelda*, † 1287). Cf. below, § 285.

---

[1] "The Book of Spiritual Graces," with "Notices from the contemplative life of the sainted virgin Mechtilde of Helfeda," newly published by *Reischl*, Ratisbon, 1857; conf. Vienna Journal of Universal Literature, nros. 44 and 48, year

---

1860. The best *reviewed* edition by *Witte*, Berlin, 1862, in 4to and 8vo; *Wegele*, The Life and Works of DANTE, Jena, 1852; German transl. and explanation by Philalethes (King John of Saxony), Dresden, 1839–49 and oftener, 3 vols.; by *Witte*, Berlin, 1865.— The chief English translations are *Boyd's* (1785) and *Cary's* (1814), in blank verse; *Wright's* (1833), in triple rhymes; *Cayley's*, in the original ternary rhyme (from 1851–54, notes 1854); *Dr. John Carlyle's*, the *Inferno*, in prose, with a commentary (1849); *H. W. Longfellow's*, in blank verse (1867).

CHAPTER VI.

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL LIFE—PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE—PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 259. *Religious and Moral Life.*

†**Montalembert*, Histoire de Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie (Paris, 1836); English by Mary Hackett; German, *Städler*, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1837, especially in the preface, 3 ed., Cologne, 1853. *Ratisbonne*, Life of *St. Bernard;* above all, in the introduction; excellent pen-pictures in *Leo's* Lectures on German History, Vol. III. *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 510 sq.

The ecumenical and provincial councils of this epoch enacted many prohibitory canons, from which may be learned the chief evils that then afflicted the world. These were acts of barbarity and violence; armed brigandage against pilgrims and churches; a disregard of the Truce of God; the extravagant practice of engaging in tournaments and dangerous combats; the atrocious persecution carried on against the Jews; the inhuman treatment of captured enemies; and, finally, assassination, usury, and the violation of corpses then reputed holy; to which may be added *superstition* in its varous forms,[1] *witchcraft, and magic.*

The sight of these disorders called from St. Bernard, St. Hildegarde, and other distinguished personages of this epoch, expressions of deep and poignant grief; and from pontiffs, ever vigilant in their solitude for the Christian people, fears that the churches might be eventually destroyed or permitted to go to ruin. It is not difficult to assign the cause of these evils. There was the *controversy on investitures*, which lasted fifty years, and the *conflict between the Popes and the Hohenstaufens*, which lasted twice that length of time. Add to these an *ill-regulated and inordinate desire of freedom;* the constant grasping after privilege and exemption, issuing eventually in a powerful aristocracy, so strong as to menace the throne itself; and, finally, the imperfect organization of the machinery of civil government and the want of necessary police regulations, all contributed, each in its own way, to perpetuate a barbarous condition of things, and, in many instances, to stifle the religious sentiments of the people.

---

[1] *Fehr*, Superstition and the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages, Stuttg. 1857. *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV.

But, if the blots and stains of the Middle Ages be conspicuous, it is because the purity of the surface on which they are found make them so. Deeds of *excellence* and *goodness* abound. The Middle Ages were *religious* and *theological* in character. Every tendency and display of energy bore upon it the impress of religion, proving the correctness of the fine remark of Goethe,[1] that "ages of *faith* are always majestic, exercise an elevating influence upon the mind, and are fruitful of good both to contemporaries and to posterity." The numerous *crusades* undertaken in the Middle Ages, the sacrifices they entailed, and the results of which they were productive, amply justify the statement of Goethe. *Faith ruled supreme* in the Middle Ages; the claims of the soul, religious feelings and aspirations were paramount; everything had a tendency to raise one's thoughts from earth to Heaven; and this tendency pervading every class of society made people extremely *credulous* of all sorts of *miracles*.[2] This ready credulity, though giving rise to some extravagances, exercised upon the whole a beneficial influence.

Another manifestation of the religious sentiments of these times was the *general enthusiasm* of the people *for the erection of great and magnificent minsters and churches.* Troops of pious confraternities, composed of persons of every age and rank and of both sexes, might be seen assembling from far and near, to build to the Lord a dwelling worthy His majesty. The splendid cathedral-church of Our Lady of Chartres was built in this way.[1]

---

[1] Eastern and Western Divan.

[2] Speaking of these miracles, *Hurter* (Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 537–548) says: "The miraculous stories that abound in every writer of these times prove that the belief in miracles was general and exercised a vital influence. Some of these reputed miracles may be at once dismissed as fabulous; others have assumed a fabulous character from having been decked out with the usual embellishments of fable; but many of them drive criticism to the alternative of either acknowledging itself synonymous with negation or confessing its incompetency to judge in the premises. But, whatever be the ultimate decision, one fact can not, in any event, be denied—viz., that these abundant miracles must have exercised a determining influence upon the lives of thousands." — "Many of these miracles may be fairly declared childish and grotesque, but behind so much rubbish one may recognize the influence of a higher power, all-ruling and omnipresent, whose ubiquitous providence protects the God-fearing, inspires the faint of heart with courage, and punishes the wicked."

Finally, were not the numerous *monastic congregations* that then sprung up, whose founders were not unfrequently the descendants of powerful and noble houses, a living proof of the depth and sincerity of the religious life of the epoch? Its active energy pervaded all things and cropped out everywhere. Even the earth, the marvelous handiwork of God, became an object of tender solicitude and childlike love. The student of nature conceived the celestial bodies to be directed in their course by a supernatural agency, to be animated by a supernatural power, and sought to trace in them mysterious analogies and relations to the duties and convictions of man, purchased by the Blood of Christ, and to the expressions and signs of Christian belief and symbolism. The instincts of animals, the varied phenomena of the vegetable and floral kingdoms, the singing of birds, the properties of the precious metals and stones, came to be symbolical of Christian verities, and were made to express in rich and varied imagery the strongest and tenderest emotions of the human soul. All nature was believed, by the simple, the childlike, and the pure faith of those days, to be in sympathy with religion and religion's truths and instincts. People were wont to go out, of a Christmas Eve, and proclaim to the trees of the forest that the coming of Christ was at hand, and to call upon the earth to open and bud forth a Savior (*aperiatur terra et germinet Salvatorem.*) Everything that met the eye—the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, the trees of the forest—all bore upon them the impress of faith and hope. The earth and all thereon, the universe and all its wonders, were united by the bonds of science and love, and under all and through all *ran the golden thread of faith.* In those times the Christian religion, with its inherent vitality of force, its mysteries and its promises, was the well-spring and center of all energy and action—the great heart whence went forth the warm stream of life, whose pulsations were felt to the uttermost limits of the body social, and gave manifestations of its presence even in *guilds* and *national festivals.*[1] The atmosphere of religion was everywhere; and so holy was it—so pure, so exhilarating—that it seemed the days of the Apostles had returned and Christianity was once more in her first beauty and lustre, so loyal then were the hearts of men to the teachings and instincts of faith.

---

[1] *Wilken,* Hist. of the Crusades, Vol. III., p. 45 sq.

Were proof wanted of the presence then of this all-pervading religious spirit, we might cite, aside from countless pious warriors like Godfrey de Bouillon, whose names are clothed in a glory of unfading lustre, the royal saints Louis of France, Leopold of Austria, Ferdinand of Castile and Leon, Elizabeth of Thuringia, Hedwige of Silesia and Poland, and Eleanor of England, besides an innumerable *host of other saints* in every walk of life,[2] from royalty down to the humblest peasant, who were a pattern to their own age and a light to every succeeding one since. We might also refer to the "*Manual of Saints*"—that treasure of the faithful, which *Jacobus de Voragine*, Archbishop of Genoa († 1298), by incorporating into it the traditions living in the mouths of the people, transformed into the "*Golden Legends*" (*Legenda aurea*).[3]

Unfortunately, the frequent performance of the *mysteries* and *miracle plays*,[4] which, either intentionally or otherwise, were often turned from their original and legitimate aim and made the occasion of unseemly and irreverent buffoonery; the satirical tone and undue license assumed by the *Minnesingers*, whose audacity led them to attack the Blessed Virgin and God Himself; the ludicrous profanity of those relics of the Pagan Saturnalia called the *Feasts of Fools and Asses*, celebrated at Christmas and New Year's, before the beginning of Lent, and at Easter, in which ecclesiastics participated, thus lending the encouragement of their presence to disgraceful parodies on the Holy Mysteries[1] and the dignitaries of the

---

[1] Cf. *Cantù*, Universal History, Vol. VI., p. 720 sq. Description of the National Festivals of divers Countries.

[2] The principal saints of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries were enumerated by *Klein*, Ch. Hist., Vol. I., p. 773–779. Cf. *Villeneuve-Trans*, Hist. de St. Louis, etc., Paris, 1839, 3 vols. See above, p. 600 sq.

[3] Legenda aurea s. hist. Lombardica, Argent. 1429 and oftener; translated into many languages; ad. optim. libror. fidem recensuit, emendavit, replevit, etc., *Dr. Graesse*, Lips. et Dresd. 1843; 2 ed., Lips. 1850. *Haupt*, On the Book of Martyrs, written in the Midland High-German dialect, being a report made in the Imperial and Royal Academy of Sciences, Vienna, 1872. *Rousseau*, Violet Wreaths of Saints, or Poetry and Art in the Catholic Church, Frankfort, 1835, 6 vols. (incomplete.)

[4] Favorite subjects: The historical portions of the Old and New Testament and the lives of the saints—the former for "*Mysteries*," the latter for "*Miracle-Plays*." Instances, the "Mystery of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, St. Cath-

---

arine." (Tr.) See *Mone*, Plays of the Middle Ages, Carlsruhe, 1856, 2 vols. *Ed. Devrient*, Hist. of the German Dramatic Art., Lips. 1848, 3 vols. *Cantù*, Vol. VI., p. 729 sq. *Hase*, The Religious Drama, a Historical Review, Lps. 1858. *Holland*, The German Theater during the Middle Ages, and the Ammergau Passion Play, Munich, 1861. † *Ludwig Clarus*, The Passion Play of Oberammergau, Munich, 1860. *Wilken*, History of Mysteries and Miracle-Plays (der geistlichen Spiele) in Germany, Götting. 1872.

[1] *Du Fresne*, Glossar. ad scriptt. med. et infim. Lat. s. v. Cerula Kalendae. *Tiliot*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la fête des Foux, Laus. 1751.—*Dürr*, Commentatio historica de Episcopo puerorum, Mogunt. 1755. From the fact that in the *Feast of Fools* an inferior cleric was chosen bishop, it was sometimes called the Subdeacon's Feast. The cleric thus chosen travestied the pontifical functions; but when incensed, instead of olibanum, an offensive and foul matter was used. The stalls of the canons were filled by others of the inferior clerics, who sang: "*Deposuit potentes et exultavit humiles.*" At the close of these mock ceremonies, the *choir* was turned into a banqueting hall, and was the scene of unseemly antics and disgraceful performances of all sorts. The *Feast of Asses* is supposed to have been originally intended to commemorate the Flight into Egypt or the Entry into Jerusalem, and accordingly celebrated about Christmas or Easter. An *ass* was clad in a surplice, and, when conducted into church, his entry was greeted with the singing of a ludicrous canticle, the refrain of which was, "*Hez, Sire Asnes.*"(*a*) A remark of *J. P. Richter* (Propedeutics of Aesthetics) is here apposite: "It was precisely in the most religious epochs that the Feasts of Fools and Asses, the representation of the mysteries and mock sermons on Easter Sunday, were most in favor. There was no apprehension of religion suffering any detriment, being too far above anything like a travesty. The same rule holds here as in the case of the Socrates of Xenophon and Aristophanes—the former wâs not injured by the travesty of the latter. The very fact of a travesty proves the existence of something higher travestied; a comedy presupposes a tragedy."

(*a*) "Hez, Sire Asnes, car chantez.
Belle bouche rechignez
Vous aurez du foin assez
Et de l'avoine a planter."
—*Dufresne*, Glossar. ad scriptt. med. et infim. Lat. ad verbum Festum (asinorum). (Tr.)

Church, formed a painful contrast to the consoling examples of holy living and pure faith just noticed. Of a piece with these irreverent fooleries were the so-called feasts of *St. Gregory* or the *Holy Innocents*, celebrated by the students of cloister and cathedral schools on December 28th, one of the chief features of which was the travesty of the dress and office of a *bishop* or *abbot* by one of the students.

If ever there was an exemplification of the saying, "there is but a step from the sublime to the ridiculous," or of the rule that where vital energies abound, they will manifest themselves in crude, unbecoming, and sometimes indecent extravagances, it is surely to be found in profane farces of this sort. An attempt has been made to trace the origin of these abuses to the youthful and vicious Pope Benedict IX., but unsuccessfully, as they are mentioned, long before his time, in a letter written by Pope Zachary to St. Boniface.[1] They existed to a disgraceful extent in the churches of France and Germany at the beginning of the twelfth century, and, in spite of the inhibitions of bishops and councils, continued to hold their place until the fifteenth, when they wholly disappeared.

§ 260. *Penitential Discipline—Jubilee Indulgences.* (*Cf. pp.* 383 *sq.*, 453 *sq.*, 566 *sq.*)

For the bibliography, see Vol. I., § 90; and *Bendel*, The Indulgences of the Church, p. 53-72.

During this epoch the penitentiary rules underwent considerable modification, for reasons which will be presently stated. In the first place, the ancient "*sends*," or synodal courts, were in abeyance, thus leaving every one full freedom in the matter of confession. As a consequence, people grew indifferent, and ceased to frequent the Sacraments. Hence, the *Fourth Ecumenical Council of Lateran*[2] passed a decree providing that all the faithful of both sexes who had come to the age of discretion should confess their sins at least *once a year*, either to their own pastor or to a priest authorized by him, and approach the Holy Table at Easter. Owing to the increasing number of sectaries and the necessity of the faithful being more pronounced in profession and practice, it was enacted, a little later on, that "every one not wishing to be suspected of heresy shall confess *three times* yearly."

---

[1] Cf. *Pertz*, Monumenta, T. II., p. 114 sq.; *Binterin*, History of German Councils, Vol. II., p. 173.

[2] *Conc. Lateran.* iv., can. 21. See above, p. 584, note 2 and the text.

Protestants have asserted that, according to the text of *Gratian*, confession, though useful, is not indispensable, and that the *septenary* number of the Sacraments originated with *Peter Lombard*, notwithstanding that this author teaches, in harmony with the unvarying doctrine of the Church, that the three essential elements of the Sacrament of Penance are *contrition*, *confession*, and *satisfaction*. The question discussed in Gratian's text is simply this: Does the remission of sins follow immediately upon the penitence of the individual, thus making the priestly absolution a purely declaratory act, or does it follow the pronouncing, by the priest, of the sacramental form of absolution?[1]

Again, the necessity of confession is also shown from the fact that both Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas, to the question—"Should one, in case of sudden approach of death, confess to a laymen in the absence of a priest?"—replied in the affirmative. *Innocent III.* expresses himself as follows: "*Confession* should lead to penitence and satisfaction. The very shame men feel in avowing their sins is not the least part of satisfaction." As regards the Sacraments, their *septenary* number has been placed beyond any possible question by the testimony of Christian antiquity, and as the subject is treated with fullness and detail by Catholic theologians, it is not necessary to say more on it here.

In this, as in the preceding epoch, *public* crimes were atoned by public penances. Henry II. of England, Philip Aug. of France, and Count Raymond of Toulouse are examples of the practice. The too frequent recourse, by many bishops, to *interdict* and *excommunication* for trifling causes destroyed the salutary influence of either. Thus the people of St. Omer were cut off from the Church because they had disputed with the monastery of St. Bertin the proprietorship of a few brooks and swamps; and, on another occasion, the whole of Normandy was laid under interdict by the Archbishop of Rouen (1196) because the King had fortified, for his own advantage and without leave, the castle of Roche-Andelys, belonging to that prelate.

---

[1] *Gratiani* Decret., P. II., tractat. de poenitent., quaest. 3, distinct. 1. Cf. especially c. 34-37. — *Lombardi* Sentent., lib. IV., distinct. 17, art. 1, 2.

The ancient penitentiary discipline in regard to secret sins was steadily passing into desuetude. Provided the penitent gave tokens of sincere sorrow, he was absolved before the performance of the penance enjoined. Priests were again and again urged to exercise all possible discretion in selecting penances, and, as a decided lack of earnestness and generosity in this matter was becoming daily visible,[1] they were permitted to commute the long penitential practices of antiquity into prayers, fastings, and almsdeeds, but were at the same time instructed not to omit bringing before the minds of the faithful the punishments formerly inflicted for grievous sins, that thus their enormity might be apparent and the culprits themselves roused to a proper consciousness of their guilt and excited to sorrow for their transgressions.[2] Still another cause tending to relax the ancient penitentiary rule was the practice of granting *plenary indulgences* (*indulgentiae plenariae*), or a full remission of the ancient canonical *penances*, in consideration of the performance of some other religious action in their stead. Plenary indulgences were first granted to the Crusaders; next, to those who took arms against *seditious heretics* and *pagans* in Northern Europe; and, finally, to places of pilgrimage,[3] and to those who, in making the *Jubilee*,[4] complied with the prescribed conditions.

---

[1] St. Bernard says: "Ut presbyter, cui fideles peccata confitentur, talis sit, ut sciat, quid injungat, cui parcat, quando parcere debeat, quam consolationem proferat de scripturis, etc." Sermo 3. de S. Andrea.

[2] Cf. Claud. *Fleurii* Diss. in h. e., diss. VI., §§ 2 and 11.

[3] Innocent III. saw himself constrained to restrict the conditions for granting indulgences. Conc. Lateran. IV., can. 62: Per indiscretas et superfluas indulgentias, quas quidam ecclesiarum praelati facere non verentur, et claves ecclesiae contemnuntur, et poenitentialis satisfactio enervatur. (*Mansi.*, T. XXII., p. 1049; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 65.)

[4] The appellation, שׁנת היובל, shanath hajjobel, annus jubilaei and its object are stated in Levit. xxv. 10–13.

The Jubilee of the Jews, or rather a custom analogous to it, was perpetuated under the Christian dispensation, and during the closing year of every century an extraordinary throng of pilgrims might be seen in Rome. Moved by the recital of an old man, aged one hundred and seven years, who said he remembered that, just a century previous, he had witnessed similar throngs of people coming to the Holy City, Boniface VIII., in 1300, granted a plenary indulgence to all pilgrims who from penitential motives should visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul. Strangers were required to make these visits on fifteen and the Romans on thirty different days in the course of the year.[1] On this occasion, two hundred thousand pilgrims gathered about the Holy Father. The interval between one jubilee and another was reduced by Clement VI. (1343) to fifty years, by Urban VI. (1389) to thirty-three, and by Paul II. (1470) to twenty-five. The venal spirit of the Romans could not resist the temptation of reaping from these pious gatherings a harvest of sordid gain.

It is highly important to know the opinions of the great theologians of this epoch on indulgences. *Alexander of Hales* is the author of the doctrine that they are drawn from the superabundant merits of Christ and His saints.[2] *Albertus Magnus* gives three opinions on the subject.[3] Alexander of

---

[1] See the bull in *Raynald*, ad. a. 1300, nr. 4, and in Extravag. commun., lib. V., tit. IX., de poenit., c. 1. Cf. the Holy Jubilee and other indulgences, explained by the author of "Catholic Homilies," Augsburg, 1824. *Hirscher*, Catholic doctrine on Indulgences and their application, 6 ed., Tübingen, 1854. †*Bendel*, Ecclesiastical Indulgences from a historical, dogmatical, and practical point of view, Rottweil, 1847. †*Gröne*, Indulgences, their history, etc., Ratisbon, 1863.

[2] *Alex. Hales*, Sum., P. IV., quaest. 52, membr. 3: Indulgentiae et relaxationes fiunt de *meritis supererogationis membrorum Christi et maxime de supererogationibus meritorum Christi*, quae sunt spiritualis thesaurus Ecclesiae. Hunc autem thesaurum non est omnium dispensare, sed tantum eorum, qui praecipue vicem Christi gerunt, i. e. episcoporum.

[3] *Albert. Mag.* in Sent., lib. IV., dist. 20, art. 16, 17: Indulgentiae sive relaxatio est remissio poenae injunctae ex vi clavium et thesauro supererogationis perfectorum procedens. Artic. 17. Dicendum, quod tres opiniones antiquitus fuerent circa indulgentias. Quidam enim dixerunt, indulgentias omnino nihil valere, et esse eas piam fraudem etc. Sed isti ad ludum puerorum distrahunt facta Ecclesiae, et hoc fere sapere haeresin puto. Ideo alii, plus quam oportuit contradicentes, dixerunt, quod simpliciter sicut pronuntiantur indulgentiae, ita

Hales also teaches that, by the power of the Keys, indulgences may be applied by the Church (*per modum suffragii*) to the dead as well as the living[1]—a doctrine which *St. Thomas Aquinas* establishes by still stronger arguments.[2]

As some sought to obtain indulgences to escape the severity of penitential discipline, others, following the example of Peter Damian,[3] *now* took an opposite course, and scourged themselves severely. St. Louis of France, on one occasion, gave his courtiers as New Year's gifts, small silver chain-disciplines with which to flagellate themselves. The fever for pilgrimages and self-flagellation at one time became so general that almost the whole of the inhabitants of *Perugia* (1261)[4] were seized with it; and at Strasburg, when the approach of a pestilence threatened to desolate the city, twelve hundred of the inhabitants went through the streets scourging themselves to avert the calamity.[5]

---

valeant sine omni alia conditione intellecta vel dicta. Sed quia isti nimis bonum forum dant de misericordia Dei, ideo tertiae opinioni mihi assentiendum videtur, — scil. quod indulgentiae valent, sicut eas valere praedicat Ecclesia.

[1] *Alex. Hales*, P. IV., quaest. 23, art. 2, membr. 5: Potest ergo dici, quod illis, qui sunt in purgatorio, possunt fieri relaxationes secundum conditiones praedictas (sc. potestas clavium ex parte conferentis; ex parte ejus, cui confertur, caritas, credulitas, devotio) *per modum suffragii* sive impetrationis, non per modum judiciariae absolutionis sive commutationis.

[2] *Thom. Aquin.* Sum. in suppl., P. III., quaest. 25—i. e., Commentar. in Sent., lib. IV., dist. 20, quaest. 1, art. 3, and particularly quaest. 71, art. 10, from Comment. in Sent., lib. IV., dist. 45, quaest. 2, art. 3: "Utrum indulgentiae ecclesiae prosint mortuis?" Here it is said, among the rest: "Si autem indulgentia sub hac forma fiat: *Quicunque fecerit hoc vel illud, ipse et pater ejus, vel quicunque alius ei adjunctus, in purgatorio detentus, tantum de indulgentia habebit:* talis indulgentia non solum vivo, sed etiam *mortuo* proderit. Non enim est aliqua ratio, qua Ecclesia transferre possit communia merita, quibus indulgentiae innituntur, in vivos, et non in mortuos."

[3] See above, p. 410.

[4] Thus it is said in the Chronic. Austral. ad a 1261: "Hoc anno orta est publica poenitentia per multas provincias, quae pro magno miraculo habebatur. Multi homines pauperes et divites, ministeriales, milites, rustici, senes et juvenes ibant nudi a cingulo et supra, et caput totum texerant cum lineo panno, portantes secum vexilla et ardentes candelas et flagella in manibus, quibus se quidam percutiebant usque ad effusionem sanguinis et cantabant devotos cantus," etc. (Freheri Scriptt., ed. *Struve*, T. I., p. 461.)

[5] Cf. *Closener's* Chronicle of Strasburg (Chronicles of German Cities, published by *Hegel* and others, Vol. VIII., p. 104–120).

PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

As the nations lately converted to Christianity took but little interest in the great questions that agitated the Church during these times, they necessarily occupy only a subordinate place in contemporaneous history. As missionaries, when about to set out on their labors, had, from the earliest ages of the Church, made application to Rome for a sanction of their work, so now the Eternal City was more than ever regarded as the center of all missionary enterprise and of institutions designed for the propagation of the faith. *Honorius III.* urgently requested the bishops of every country to send reliable and earnest candidates to Rome, where they would receive such training and instruction as would fit them for the foreign missions. The Popes also seconded the work of spreading and establishing the faith of Christ by sending, when the time arrived, legates or bishops clothed with plenary powers, into the newly converted countries.

§ 261. *Conversion of Pomerania and the Island of Rügen.*

Anonymi Vita Ottonis Pommeran. Apost. libb. III. (*Canisii* Lectt. antiq., T. III., P. II., p. 35–96. *Andreae,* Abbatis Babebergens. Vita Ottonis (Ludovici script. rerum Bamberg., T. I.) *Ebonis* Vita Otton. Episc. (*Jaffé,* Monum. Bamberg., T. V. bibl. rer. Germ. 1869, also published separately.) *Zagler,* Otho I., Bishop of Bamberg, Munich, 1862. *Sulzbeck,* The Life of St. Otho, Ratisbon, 1866. *Helmodi* Chronica Slavorum, ed. Bangert, Lübeck, 1659, 4to, in *Pertz's* Monum., T. XXI.; Germ. by *Dr. Laurent,* in Vol. VII. of the Historians of German Antiquity, Berlin, 1852. *Kannegiesser,* Hist. of the Conversion of the Pomeranians, Greifswalde, 1824. *Steinbrück,* The Cloisters of Pomerania, Stettin, 1796, 4to. *Barthold,* Hist. of Pomerania and Rügen, Hamburg, 1839, Vol. I. *Neander,* Ch. Hist., Vol. V., p. 1–40. *Torry's* Engl. transl., Vol. IV., p. 1–32. **Giesebrecht,* Hist. of the Times of German Emperors, Vol. III., p. 954–973.

The first efforts of the Poles to introduce Christianity into Pomerania were frustrated by the continuous insurrections by which they were accompanied. The bishopric of *Colberg* ceased to exist, and *Reinbert,* its first bishop, was murdered (1015) while on a journey to Russia. It was not until after the subjugation of *Wladislaus,* duke of Pomerania, by *Boleslaus III.,* duke of Poland, that the Pomeranians consented to embrace Christianity.

Bernard, a Spanish priest and hermit, after having been consecrated Bishop of Pomerania by the Pope, in 1122, attempted to convert the inhabitants, but the poverty of his dress excited their ridicule. How, they asked, could the Lord of the world have commissioned a poor beggar to be His representative? Forced to abandon the country, he withdrew to Bamberg and entered a cloister.

After his victories, Boleslaus III. invited *Otho*, Bishop of Bamberg, to make a fresh effort to convert the Pomeranians. Appointed papal legate by *Calixtus II.*, and profiting by the experience of Bernard, Otho provided himself with a numerous and splendid retinue, and entered Western Pomerania in 1124. He was kindly received by Wladislaus, already a Christian, and having, during a previous sojourn in Poland, become acquainted with the Slavic customs, conducted himself with so much prudence and tact that he readily conciliated the good-will of the people, converted many, and on one occasion, at *Pyritz*, baptized seven thousand.[1] He was also very successful at the city of *Camin*, where many of the inhabitants had been prepared for baptism by the Christian duchess; but at the commercial cities of *Wollin* and *Stettin*, he encountered the most obstinate resistance. The inhabitants of the latter cried out to Otho and his companions: "What have we in common with you? We will not give up the laws of our country; and, as for our religion, we are content with it. Does not every sort of vice exist among the Christians? Do they not abuse each other? Away with this worship; we will have none of it." Still, Otho persevered, and his unvarying gentleness, together with the promise of the Polish duke, that they should enjoy perpetual peace and a reduction of tribute, induced them to embrace Christianity. The inhabitants of Wollin soon followed their example. In a very short time there were above twenty thousand neophytes in eight of the principal cities of Pomerania. Encouraged by the exemplary conduct of their duke, who sent away his twenty-four concubines, the inhabitants ceased committing the crime of infanticide, exposing their children, burning their dead, and other pagan customs. After the departure of Otho, who re-returned to his own diocese in 1125, many fell away from the faith, and others mingled pagan practices with Christian rites; but even at a distance the good Bishop did not cease to watch with fatherly care over the new Christian communities. He again visited them in 1128, and after his death, in 1139, *Wollin* was created a bishopric, and *Adalbert*, the friend and companion of Otho, appointed its first bishop. It was placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, by *Innocent II.* in 1140, and transferred to *Camin* in 1170.

---

[1] A monument erected there, by William III. of Prussia, in honor of the Apostle of the Pomeranians, commemorates the event.

The island of *Rügen*, the home of Slavic superstition, opposed a most determined resistance to Christianity. After its subjugation by *Waldemar* in 1168, *Absalom of Roskilde*, a warlike bishop, overthrew the temples of the gods, and the Rugians, beholding the impotence of the idols in which they had placed their trust, consented to receive baptism.

§ 262. *Conversion of Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland.*[1]

It is said the Livonians gained their first knowledge of Christianity from some merchants of Bremen and Lübeck (1158). *Meinhard*, an Augustinian monk of the monastery of *Siegebert*, in Holstein, made substantial progress in planting the seeds of the Gospel among them in 1186, and by the munificence of *Kaupo*, a distinguished Livonian, was enabled to build a church at *Yxküll*, on the banks of the Dwina. After having, at the head of his new converts, repelled an assault of their pagan countrymen, Meinhard went to Rome and was there consecrated Bishop of Yxküll. Returning, he found the natives ill-disposed to receive him. After his death, in 1196, Pope Celestine III., ordered *Berthold*, second Bishop of Yxküll, formerly abbot of the Cistercian monastery of *Loccum*, in Hanover, to lead a crusade against them. Though victorious over the Livonians, he himself perished in battle (1198). The vanquished being forced to receive baptism, plunged into the Dwina, as soon as the crusaders had withdrawn, to wash out any stain it might have made. *Albert of Apeldern*, a canon of Bremen, the successor to Berthold, headed a second crusade against the Livonians, transferred the episcopal see to *Riga*, founded in 1200 by himself, and formed in 1202 the Order of the *Sword-bearers*.[1] *Vinno of Rohrbach*, their first Grand Master, was assassinated in 1208. An unfortunate quarrel, which broke out between the Bishop and the Order, concerning the disposition of territory either already conquered or to be conquered, was amicably settled by Innocent III. in 1210.

---

[1] *Henricii Letti*, about 1226, Origg. Livoniae sacrae et civil. s. Chron. c. notis Gruberi., Francof. et Lps. 1740 f. *Parrot*, Formation of languages, Hist. of the Mythology of the Livonians, Esthonians, and Lithuanians, Stuttg. 1828. *Kruse*, Necrolivonia, or Antiquities of Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland, before the introduction of Christianity, Dorpat, 1842. *Kienitz*, Twenty-four books of the History of Livonia, Dorpat, 1847, Vol. I. *Von Schölzer*, Livonia, and the Beginnings of German Life in the Baltic North, Berlin, 1850.

Bishop Albert allied himself to the Russians in a war against the *Esthonians*, and both having been joined by William II., King of Denmark, completely subjugated their enemies. A controversy which now broke out between the Danish Archbishop of Lund and the Bishop of Riga, concerning the jurisdiction of Esthonia, was decided in favor of the latter. *Dorpat*, conquered in 1223, became the episcopal see of Esthonia; and *Riga* was raised in 1253, by Pope Innocent IV., to an archbishopric, with Albert Suerbeer, formerly Archbishop of Armagh, as its first metropolitan. The small country of *Semgallen*, which had been Christian since 1218, was made a diocese. *Seelburg* was its episcopal city. The see became extinct when the country, except the small portion of it belonging to the Teutonic Order, passed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Riga.

The conversion of the *Courlanders* (1230) was greatly facilitated by the establishment of the sees of *Wirland* and *Reval* through the energetic efforts of the laborious Bishop Albert († 1229). In 1237, Gregory IX. affiliated the *Sword-bearers* to the Teutonic Order.

§ 263. *Christianity in Prussia.*

Scriptores rerum Prussicarum, Sources of Ancient Prussian History until the Decline of the Supremacy of the Teutonic Order, edited by *Hirsch*, *Töppen*, and *Strehlke*, Lps. 1863 sq. Petri de Duisburg (Priest of the Teutonic Order

---

[1] *Pott*, De gladiferis seu fratribus militiae Christi. Erlangen, 1806.

†1336), Chron. Prussiae, ed. cum XIV dissert. *Hartknoch*, Jenae, 1679, 4to. (*Voigt*, History of Prussia, Vol. III., p. 603–626.) *Arnold*, Ch. Hist. of Prussia, Königsberg, 1769. *Voigt*, Hist. of Prussia, Königsberg, 1827 sq., Vol. I.–IV. The *same*, Hist. of Marienburg, same place, 1824. *Giesebrecht*, The first missionary in Prussia (Germ. Speeches, 1871).

According to the oldest traditions the three principal gods worshiped by the Prussians were *Perkunos*, the god of thunder, *Potrimpos*, the god of corn and fruit, and *Pikullos*, the god of destruction. The national sanctuary of all the gods was at *Romove*, the residence of the chief-priest or *Griwe*. The Griwen, who were at once priests, lawgivers, and judges, opposed Christianity to the full extent of their influence and power.[1] *Adalbert* of Prague, who was the first to attempt the conversion of the Prussians, together with his companion Gaudentius, suffered a martyr's death, April 23, 997, at the hands of a priest, because he rashly trod upon sacred ground. Before dying, he spoke words of encouragement to his companions, saying: "Be not afflicted, we know for whom we suffer; to die for Jesus is the most glorious of deaths." *Bruno*, a Benedictine monk, who had been authorized by Pope Sylvester II. to preach the Gospel to these obstinate idolaters, also suffered martyrdom, February 18, 1008. Two centuries later (1207), *Gottfried, a Pole, Abbot of Lukina*, again undertook the laborious task of propagating Christianity in Prussia, but the true apostle of this country was *Christian*, a Cistercian monk of the monastery of *Oliva* (1209–10).[2] He and his brethren first preached the Gospel in the territories of Culm, and along the frontiers of Pomerania. He sent a report of the results of his labors to Pope Innocent III., by whom he was consecrated Bishop of the Prussians, in 1215. No quarter of the world escaped the watchful care of this great Pope. He was specially anxious about the new converts, recommended them to the protection of the Archbishop of Gnesen, and besought the dukes of Pomerania and Poland not to make their conversion an occasion for oppressing them, lest they might excite in them an aversion to Christianity. On the return of Christian from Rome, after his consecration as bishop, the unconverted Prussians commenced a war of extermination against the Christians, and either burnt or destroyed all churches and chapels that came in their way. In self-defense, Christian requested permission from Pope Honorius III. to lead a crusade against them. His request was granted, and he was further authorized to establish such bishoprics as he might deem necessary (1217). During their stay the crusaders strongly fortified the city of *Culm* (1222), the newly established bishopric, but directly they had departed, the Prussians made themselves masters of the place and laid waste the surrounding country. These events suggested to Christian the idea of founding the *Order of the Knights of Prussia*, for the defense of the Christians of these countries. Their costume was a white mantle on which was embroidered a sword and a star. Nearly all of them perished shortly after in the battle of Strasburg, and the Prussians, pursuing their victory, destroyed the monastery of Oliva. In their distress Christian and *Conrad, Duke of Masovia*, invoked the aid of the *Teutonic Knights*, who arrived in 1226, under the lead of their Grand Master, *Herman of Salza*. After the whole country had been reduced to submission and many of the cities rebuilt, Pope Innocent IV. divided it into three bishoprics—viz., *Culm*, *Pomesania*, and *Ermeland* (1243). Another was founded after the close of the crusade at *Samland*, by Ottocar, King of Bohemia.[1]

---

[1] *Voigt*, History of Prussia, Vol. I., p. 137–163, and especially p. 574–616 (Religion and Idolatry); concerning *Romove*, p. 641–649; on the Supreme Judge and High Priest, p. 696–708. *Bender*, De veterum Prutenorum diis, Brunsbergi, 1865.

[2] *Dr. Perlbach*, The Ancient Chronicle of Oliva, Götting. 1870.

Among the later missionaries in Prussia were many friars and preachers, the best known of whom is the Polish priest, Saint *Hyacinth* († 1257). It had been the intention of the Pope, that one-third of the territory conquered by the Teutonic Knights should be possessed in freehold by the bishops, but instead of this the latter were entirely dependent upon the Order, and the Bishop of Samland having dared to resist its pretensions was cast into prison and starved to death. King Ottocar had advised that the fortress of Königsberg should be erected and put in the best possible condition of defense (1255); and it was fortunate that his advice was followed, for between the years 1260 and 1275 the Prussians were constantly in insurrection against the Teutonic Knights. In 1283, after a struggle of fifty years, the Knights were completely triumphant, but as yet little or no progress had been made in the real work of conversion.

---

[1] *Watterich*, Settlement of the State of the Teutonic Order. *Voigt*, Herman of Salza, Königsberg, 1850. Monumenta Hist. Warmiens., ed. *Wolky* et *Sage*, Mogunt. 1858.

§ 264. *Conversion of the Mongols by Western Missionaries.*

Assemani Bibl. Orient., T. III., P. I., II. — *Mosheim*, Hist. Tartaror. eccl. Helmst., 1741, 4to. *Abel-Remusat*, Memoires sur les relations polit. des princes chrétiens avec les empereurs Mongols (Memoires de l'Inst. de France. Acad. des inscript., 1822, T. VI., VII.) †*Külb*, History of Missionary Travels into Mongolia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Ratisbon, 1860, 3 vols. *Oppert*, Prester John, in legendary lore and in history, Berlin, 1864. *Huc* and *Gabet*, Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et la Chine, Paris, 1852.

In the eleventh century the Nestorians of the East penetrated into the interior of Asia, made many converts, and among them a Tartar prince of Northern China, through whose influence the whole of his tribe became Christians. Both he and his successor were known in the West by the name of *Prester John* (*Presbyter Johannes*) or the Priest-kings. Exaggerated reports brought from the East by priests and monks induced Popes Eugene III. and Alexander III. to endeavor to unite the kingdom of Prester John to the Western Church.[1] An embassy from one of the kings came to Rome, and after the consecration of its chief, returned again to the East in 1177.

During the reign of the fourth successor to Prester John the entire tribe was destroyed, and the territory taken possession of by the terrible *Genghis-Khan* (1202). The fact that the wife of this prince was a Christian, may have mollified his hatred of her co-religionists, whom he treated leniently, if not kindly. The threatened invasion of Europe by the Mongol hordes in 1241, made the princes of the West still more anxious to convert them to Christianity, and accordingly *In-*

---

[1] *Otto Frising.* VII., c. 33 (concerning Eugene); *Baron.* ad ann. 1177, nro. 33 sq. (concerning Alexander.) Cf. *Gieseler*, in Theol. Studies and Criticisms, 1837, nro. 2, p. 354 sq. Abbé *Darras* places Prester-John in the *fifteenth* century. See his Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 597.

nocent IV. and *St. Louis* of France, sent Dominicans and Franciscans into Asia, to establish, if possible, relations with their princes. *Gayuk* alone, whose mother was a Nestorian, received the Dominicans kindly and manifested a disposition to favor their teaching.[1] As negotiations relative to the choice of a religion were being simultaneously conducted by these barbarous hordes with the imans of Islamism, the bonzes of paganism, and the Christian priests, it soon became evident that Christianity had but a very slight hold on their minds. But this circumstance, and the fruitless issue of the efforts made by Gregory IX., did not deter Nicholas IV. from sending the venerable Franciscan, *John of Monte Corvino* (1288–1292), to preach to the Mongols. His labors bore fruit. The rude Mongols charmed by the stately melody of the Roman chant, and taught by the aid of pictures illustrative of the Old and New Testaments, and still more effectually by translations of portions of the Sacred Volume, embraced Christianity to the number of six thousand. *Clement V.*, when he received the news of this cheering success, sent the Franciscan seven assistants, and nominated him Archbishop of *Kambula*[2] (now Peking—i. e., Court of the North), 1307. This prelate died in 1330, and was succeeded by *Nicholas*, also a Franciscan, by whose death or captivity, the Christians of Tartary were left for eight years without a pastor to administer to them the consolations of religion. When, thirty years later (1369), the Mongols were driven from China, the small community of Peking was suppressed; the few Nestorians already there were given leave to remain, but Christian missionaries were strictly forbidden to enter the country.

The efforts made to convert the Moslems are strikingly peculiar. *St. Francis of Assisi*, impelled by a burning zeal, crossed, during the siege of Damietta, in 1219, from the Christian to the Mohammedan army and began preaching penance; and *Raymond Lullus* undertoook, at *Tunis* (1291 or

---

[1] *Raynaldus*, ad ann. 1245, nro. 16 sq. On the travels of these missionaries, see *Vincent. Bellovac.*, Specul. Hist., lib. XXXI., c. 33 sq. Cf. *Raynald.* ad ann. 1254, nro. 1 sq.

[2] *Wadding*, Annales Minorit. ad ann. 1307, n. 7.

1292), to convert the Mohammedans by his scientific system,[1] of which mention has been made on a preceding page. Raymond being an original thinker, and having a large acquaintance with the natural sciences, held that science should not be purely speculative. After confuting the arguments advanced by the Mohammedans who had come to hear him, he said: "Every wise man must acknowledge that to be the true religion which ascribes to God the greatest perfection; which gives the clearest conception of every Divine attribute; and which most fully demonstrates the harmony existing among them all." One of the Saracens, more fanatical than the rest, represented to the authorities the danger to the Moslem faith from an intrepid and learned advocate like Raymond, and the latter was in consequence cast into prison, and condemned to death; but through the kind offices of one of the better disposed, his life was spared, and he himself sent out of the country with the menace that if he should ever return he would be stoned to death. After his return to Europe, finding that his efforts in Cyprus and Armenia, to convert the schismatics of the Oriental Church were fruitless, and that his new system met with little favor in the universities of Italy and France, where he gave lectures on it, he again set out for the northern coast of Africa (1306 or 1307). He visited the city of *Bugia*, where, in the presence of a vast concourse of people, he proclaimed "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false; and this he was prepared to prove to all." The crowd were about to lay violent hands upon him, when the mufti, hearing of the affair, came to his rescue and succeeded in getting him safe away. The mufti, being a skilled philosopher, challenged Raymond to produce proof of the assertion he had made, whereupon the latter answered, that the self-sufficiency, the goodness and love of God, can not be rightly understood without the doctrine of the Trinity of Persons; for if this doctrine be denied, said he, the Divine perfections must be made to depend on creation, which had a beginning in time. The goodness of God can not be conceived as inoperative, but if the Trinity be denied, it follows that until the creation God's goodness was inactive, and consequently lacking in perfection. Self-communication is an essential element of the highest good, but deny the Trinity, and it is impossible to understand this as a perfect and eternal act.

---

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VI., p. 638 sq. Fr. tr., Vol. 13, p. 510 sq., and *Herzog's* Cyclop., Vol. VIII., p. 558–562.

His bold defense of his faith cost him dearly. He was cast into a narrow dungeon, and while there the most tempting offers of wealth and honor were made to him, on condition he would embrace Moslemism, but to no purpose. Finally, he was put on board a ship and sent out of the country, but the vessel going aground near Pisa, he lost all his books and whatever else he possessed in the way of baggage, and barely escaped with his life to that city. He next conceived the design either of founding a new religious military Order, or bringing about a union among those already existing for the purpose of combating the Saracens, and conquering the Holy Land. He also wished to have professorships of the Oriental languages founded, as a means of facilitating the conversion of the Jews and Saracens. He came to the Ecumenical Council of Vienne, in 1311, for the purpose of urging the matter, and though unsuccessful in the former project, induced Pope Clement V. to have an ordinance passed providing for the foundation of chairs of the Arabic, Chaldee, and Hebrew languages, in all the cities where the Papal Court resided, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca.

Raymond now entered the *Third* Order of St. Francis, and expressed an ardent wish to die the death of a martyr—to lay down his life for Christ, who had died for him. In 1314 he made a third voyage to the coast of Africa. Proceeding to Tunis, he labored secretly for a time among a small band of Christians, but thirsting for a martyr's crown, he finally proclaimed openly that he was the same person who had been on a former occasion banished the country, and warned the Mohammedans that the judgment of God would come upon them if they did not abjure their errors. The people now fell upon him, dragged him out of the city, and by orders of the sultan, stoned him to death, June 30, 1315. Some merchants of Majorca obtained permission to procure the body of Raymond, which they conveyed back to the island where he had founded a Franciscan convent for the education of missionaries to be sent to the Mohammedans.

The Greek Church. (Continuation of §§ 207, 210.)

Hefele, Suppl. to the Hist. of the Greek Church (in Supplements to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., p. 414 sq.) *Pichler*, Hist. of the Ecclesiastical Schism between the East and the West, Vol. I., p. 254–420.

After the Greek Church had broken with the Church of the West, she would seem to have entirely lost her former energy and warmth of life, and to have done little more than exist.

The works of *Nicholas*, *Bishop of Methone* († P. A. D. 1166), bear some traces of originality of thought, but those of *Nicetas Choniates* († P. A. D. 1206),[2] are little more than compilations from earlier ecclesiastical writers, and the same may be said of the writings of Oecumenius, Theophylactus, and others. Perhaps the best known and most marked work of this character is that entitled the "*Apparatus*,"[3] written by *Euthymius Zigabenus*, at the request of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus. It consists of a collection of the finest and strongest passages of the Fathers, arranged with a special view to the refutation of heretics and the defense of the doctrines of the Church.

Still, the vigor which commonly attends the propagation of new sects, or the revival of old ones, no matter how secretly the work may be carried on, imparted to the Greek Church a fictitious life and an apparent activity.

At the opening of the twelfth century, the emperor, Alex-

---

[1] *Ἀνάπτυξις τῆς θεολογικῆς στοιχειώσεως Πρόκλου Πλατωνικοῦ* ed. *Voemel*, Frcf. 1825.

[2] *Θησαυρὸς ὀρθοδοξίας*, libb. XXVII., of which but the first five books in the translation of *Pet. Morellus*, Par. 1569 (bibl. PP. Max, T. XXV.)

[3] *Πανοπλία δογματικὴ τῆς ὀρθοδ. πίστεως*. Tergov. 1711 f., in *Migne*, ser. gr. post T. 130, lat. ed. Zino, Ven. 1555 (bibl. PP. Lugd., T. XIX.) Conf. *Ullmann*, Nicholas of Methone, Euthymius Zigabenus, and Nicetas Choniates, or the Dogmatic Development of the Greek Church during the twelfth century. (Studies and Criticisms, year 1833, nro. 3.) *Gass*, in *Herzog's* Cyclop., Vol. X., p. 321 sq.

ius Comnenus (1081–1118), pursued the sect of the *Bogomiles*[1] with the zeal of a missionary, apprehended their chief *Basil*, and condemned him to be publically burned in the open space before the gates of the Church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople.[2]

The Bogomiles seem to have been an offshoot of the *Paulicians*. It was ascertained, after a searching examination, that this sect held many of the doctrines of the ancient *Massalians*, or Cathari, and of the Syrian or Saturninian Gnostics. These sectaries were drawn from the lowest ranks of life, and had a wholesome contempt of all learning. They nevertheless undertook the revision of the Bible, of which they received only the Psalms, the Prophets, the Four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, of which they admitted only the allegorical interpretation. They also taught that matter is essentially evil and in irreconcilable antagonism to the Spirit; that, as a consequence, there is no efficacy in the sacraments, and that the baptism of water is entirely without avail; that the body of Christ was, as the Docetae had taught, one in appearance only, and that the world had been created by a Demiurge.

By command of the emperor, *Euthymius Zigabenus* composed a full account and refutation of the Bogomilian errors.

---

[1] *Mich. Pselli περὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων διάλογος* ed. *Hasenmüller*, Kil. 1688. Annal. Comn. Alex. XV., p. 486 sq. Their doctrine, in *Euthymii Zigaben.* Panoplia., P. II., Tit. 23. Euthymii Zigabeni narratio de Bogomilis, primum in Germ. ed. *Gieseler*, P. I., 4to, Goett. 1841 (Programme); Pars II., Goett. 1842. WORKS: *Wolf*, Hist. Bogomilor., Diss. III., Vit. 1712. *Engelhardt*, The Bogomiles (Essay on Eccl. Hist., Erlangen, 1832, nro. 2). Euthymius Zigabenus gives, in the following terms, the etymology of the name: Βὸγ *μὲν γὰρ ἡ τῶν* Βουλγάρων *γλῶσσα καλεῖ τὸν θεόν μίλουι δὲ τὸ ἐλέησον*; others, again, in the sense of *θεόφιλοι*, from bogomil = loving God, according to which derivation there would result an affinity with the later "*Friends of God*" in the West. Their name is derived from the Slavic word "Bog," signifying God, and "Mil," His mercy. They were called by the orthodox Greeks, "Phundaites," or "wearers of the girdle. Joh. Christ. Wolf, *Historia Bogomilorum*, Dissertatio III., Wittenberg, 1712.

[2] The Emperor, having invited Basil to a feast, disguised himself, and, under pretense of wishing to become a disciple of the new teachers, succeeded in drawing from the latter a full confession of his doctrines. At the close of the feast, Basil was taken in charge by the imperial guards and conveyed to Constantinople.

The formula of abjuration which these heretics recited upon entering their sect is certainly a characteristic document.

The *Arsenians* is the name of the party, more political than religious, which derives its origin from Arsenius, Patriarch of Constantinople, by whose deposition (1265) it was occasioned. On the death of the emperor Theodore Lascaris, in 1258, Arsenius and Michael Palaeologus became the guardians of his son, John Lascaris, then but eight years of age. Palaeologus, regardless of his duty and obligations, usurped the crown, threw his ward into prison, and put out his eyes (1261). The Patriarch on hearing of these atrocities excommunicated Palaeologus, and the latter in turn had the Patriarch deposed and sent into exile, where he died in 1273. The partisans of Arsenius still held out against the Emperor and the new Patriarch, and at the death of the former (1282), were as far from a reconciliation as ever. An accommodation was finally brought about under his son, Andronicus II., when the body of Arsenius was brought back in triumph to Constantinople, and solemnly entombed in the Church of St. Sophia.[1] The members of still another sect of the Greek Church were called *Hesychasts* (*Ἡσυχασταί*), or *Quietists*, or the *Still*, and seem to have first originated about the middle of the fourteenth century among the monks of the monasteries around Mt. Athos.[2]

The Abbot *Symeon* was the most prominent teacher of this sort of mysticism. If man, said he, will acquire a knowledge of things Divine, he must withdraw from the world, and go into solitude; and there, with his head inclined upon his breast, and his eyes fixed on the umbilicus, *the seat of the faculties of the soul*, give himself to profound meditation. For a time all will be darkness in that quarter, but presently a light will break forth, and shine with brilliant effulgence.

---

[1] *Arsenii* testamentum, in Ecclesiae Graecae munumenta, ed. *Cotelerius*, Paris, 1681, T. II.; Synopsis canonum, in *Justelli* Bibl. can., p. 749 sq. Cf. *Georg. Pachymeres*, Historia rerum a Michaele Palaeologo gestar., in *Migne*, ser. gr., T. 143; de reportatione reliquiarum patriarchae Arsenii, in *Migne*, T. 144. — *Fabricii* Bibl. gr., T. XI., p. 581.

[2] *Pischon*, The Monastic Republic of Mount Athos (Pocket-book of History, year 1860. *Hess*, Suppl. toward a Hist. of the Monasteries of Mount Athos, Giessen., 1865. *Stein*, Studies on the Hesychasts, 1874.

Many of these fanatics while engaged in this chimerical search for light, lost their reason. It has been justly observed that this practice was but a feeble imitation of Buddhism.

In the year 1337 *Barlaam*, the learned Abbot of the Basilian monastery of St. Savior's, at Constantinople, entered into controversy with the Hesychasts, and from him they received the contemptuous name of *’Ομφαλοψύχοι*, or Umbilicians. Barlaam brought accusation against them before the Patriarch of Constantinople, and, among other things, charged them with holding that many other persons besides themselves, and notably, St. Anthony, had been illumined by this light, which became visible at the moment of ecstasy; and that the light visible to the eyes of the body at this moment was the same with which Christ had been clothed during His Transfiguration, on Mount Thabor.

Barlaam believed that the Hesychasts held *that this uncreated light* and God Himself were one and the same, or, in other words, that the light was inseparable from the Divine essence, and, as uncreated light can not exist outside of God, he concluded that they maintained the existence of *two Gods.* The question was brought before a council at Constantinople, in 1341, and decided in favor of Hesychasts. The council wished to compel Barlaam to retract his charges against the sectaries, but this he absolutely refused to do, and consulting for his safety, fled to the West, and shortly returned to the Church of Rome.[1]

After the departure of Barlaam, the controversy was again taken up by one of his disciples, *Gregory Akindynus*, a monk of Constantinople, who wrote against the Hesychasts a work entitled *De Essentia et operatione Dei.* The ablest defender of the latter was *Palamas*, Archbishop of Thesalonica, who, in his *Life of Christ*, kept the theory of light and the practice of Umbilicanism out of sight, but insisted that it was quite possible to make an intellectual distinction between the *essence* and the *properties* of the Divine Nature, the latter being communicable and the former incommunicable. A second council, held at Constantinople, condemned Gregory, and a third, held A. D. 1351, by order of the new emperor, took up the discussion of the above distinction between the essence and the properties of the Divine Nature, which had already been drawn out by Palamas. This distinction, he said, should always be kept in view in speaking of the Nature of God, in whom there are uncreated energies, one of which was manifested on Mount Thabor under the symbol of light. His adversaries refused to admit the distinction between the *essence* and the communicable and energizing powers of the Divine Nature, and accused Palamas of holding *that God could be discerned with the eye of the flesh.*

---

[1] *Niceph. Gregoras* XI. 10 (for Barlaam); *Cantacuzen.* II. 39 sq., against Barlaam (both in the Corp. scriptor. hist. Byz., Bonn. 1828 sq., P. XIX. sq.) Acts in *Mansi*, T. XXV. — *Petavius*, De Theol. Dogmat., T. I., lib. I., c. 12 sq. *Engelhardt*, De Hesych., Erlang. 1829. The *same*, The Arsenians and Hesychasts, in *Illgen's* Hist. Journal., Vol. VIII., p. 48–135. — *Gregorii Palamae* Opp. in *Migne*, ser. gr., T. 150, 151.

It would seem that this controversy was but an expiring gleam of those heated and subtle discussions on questions of faith, which once raged with so much violence and have never been quite extinct in the Greek Church.

The mystics of Mount Athos shared the declining fortune of the Empire, and their dispersion put an end to the controversy after it had lasted but a few years.[1]

In the repeated overtures for reconciliation, made by the Greek to the Latin Church, political interests rather than any religious desire to close a schism and restore unity of belief, were the motives of action.[2]

After the fall of the Latin Empire, in 1261, the Greek emperor, *Michael Palaeologus*, finding himself menaced by Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily, and by the Latin Emperor, Baldwin II., labored to bring about a reconciliation between the two churches, at a council held at Lyons, A. D. 1274. The bishops who represented him, among whom was George Acropolita, signed a Confession of Faith, which declared that the *Holy Ghost proceeded from both the Father and the Son* (*Filioque*), and admitted the *Supremacy* of the Holy See. The only reservation made by the Greek commissioners related to the time-honored customs of their Church, which they insisted should remain intact.[1]

---

[1] *Natalis Alex.* Hist. VIII. 90. ed. 1762. — *Dorner's* Person of Christ, II., i. 236, Clark's trans. (Tr.)

[2] *Leo Allatius* (born 1586 on the island of Chios, since 1600 in Rome, † 1669 at the age of eighty-three years): De ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis perpetua consensione, Colon. 1648, 4to. Graeciae orthodoxae scriptores, Rom. 1652 and 59, 2 T. 4to. De processu Spirit. Sancti enchirid., Rom. 1658. De utriusque eccles. in dogmate de purgatorio consensione, Rom. 1655.

Michael Palaeologus found it convenient, shortly after, to withdraw several of the concessions he had made, and Pope Martin IV. excommunicated him as a dissembler who had profanely trifled with the council. After his death, which occurred A. D. 1282, things again returned to their former condition; but the popular hatred which he had brought upon himself, first by making concessions to Rome, and next by repressing any opposition to them, was so violent that the people refused to pray for his soul, or to give Christian burial to his remains.

---

[1] See above, p. 605.

PART SECOND.

FROM THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. TO THE WESTERN SCHISM (A. D. 1303–1517).

DECLINE OF MEDIAEVAL PAPAL SUPREMACY—TRANSITION TO ITS CONDITION IN MODERN TIMES—REFORMATORY COUNCILS.

§ 265. *Literature—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

SOURCES.—Cf. *Lorenz*, Germany's Sources of History in the Middle Ages, from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1870. *Ptolem. de Fiadon*, h. e. to 1316. *Albertus Argentinensis*, Chron. 1273–1348. (*Urstis.* T. II., p. 95 sq.) *Barth. Ferrariensis* O. P., Polyhistoria, 1287–1367. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. XXIV.) *Albertinus Mussatus*, poet laureate and statesman of Padua († 1330), Hist. Augusta Henrici VII., libb. XVI.; de gestis Italicor. post mortem Henr. VII., libb. VIII. to 1317. Ludovicus Bavarus, incomplete (*Muratori*, Scriptor., T. X., and *Graevii* et *Burmanni* Thesaur. Italiae, T. VI., P. II.) *Giovanni Villani*, Statesman of Florence († 1364), Storie Fiorentine to 1348, continued by Matteo and Filippo Villani to 1364 (*Muratori*, T. XIII. sq.), Mil. 1729 f. *Jean Froissart* of Valenciennes († 1401), Chron. de France, d'Angl. etc. 1326–1400; Par. 1503 sq., 4 T. f.; revue par *Sauvage*, Lyon, 1599 sq., 4 T. In the Collec. des chroniques par *Buchon*, Par. 1824, 10–25 T. of the thirteenth century. (*Praetorius*, on Froissart, in Schlosser's Historical Archives, Vol. V., p. 213, 1833.) *Joannes* de *Winterthur*, seu *Vitoduranus*, O. S. F., Chron. 1215–1348. (*Eccard.*, T. I., better in the Thesaur. Hist. Helveticae. Tiguri, 1735 fol.) Böhmer, Fontes rer. Germanic., T. IV. Henricus de Dissenhofen and other sources of German hist., ed. *A. Huber*, Stuttg. 1868. *The Chronicles of German Cities*, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, ed. under the superintendence of *Hegel*, Lps. 1860–70, 9 vols. (of Nürnberg, Vol. I.–III.; of Augsburg, Vols IV. and V.; of Brunswick and Magdeburg, Vols. VI. and VII.; of Strasburg, Chronicle by *Closener* and *Jacob Twinger of Königshofen*, Vols. VIII. and IX.; also in *Mone's* Collection of the History of Baden, Vol. III.) *Zimmer's* Chronicle, published by *Barack*, Stuttg. 1869, 4 vols. (Library of the Literary Society of Stutt., Vols. 91–94.) *Gobelinus Persona*, dean of Bielefeld († 1420). Cosmodromium, original, from 1340–1418 (*Meibom.*, T. I. p. 53). **Antonini*, archiepisc. Florent., Summa historialis († 1459) to 1459; Norimb. 1484, 3 T. f. and oftener; also Opp., Flor. 1741 sq., T. I. *Pii* II. Commentarii rer. memorabil. a Joan. Gobelino compositi 1405–65; Frcf

1614 f. *Werner Rolevink*, Carthusian of Cologne († 1500), Fasciculus temporum to 1476, Colon. 1474 f., continued by *Linturius* to 1514 (*Pistorius Struve*, T. II., p. 347 sq.) *Coccius Sabellicus*, historian of Venice († 1506), Enneades s. rhapsodia historiarum to 1504, Venet. 1498 sq., 2 T. f. (Opp., Basil. 1560, 4 T. f.) *Joan. Trithemii* († 1516, abbot of St. James', near Würzburg), Ann. Hirsaugienses. 830–1514, St. Galli, 1690, 2 T. f.; see Vol. I., p. 42.—*Phil. de Commines* († 1509), Chron. et histoire 1464–98, Par. 1523 f. and oftener, revised by L. du *Fresnoy*, Lond. 1747, 4 T. 4to; par *Dupont*, Par. 1840 sq., 3 T. *Fr. Guicciardini*, statesman of Florence and Rome († 1540), Storia d'Italia 1493–1532, Ven. 1567, 4to, and oftener. And for the church history of North-Germany, the Metropolis of *Albert Cranz*. See Vol. I., pp. 42, 43.

During the pontificate of Boniface VIII., a tide in public opinion set in, which, extending over the whole face of society from prince to peasant, went on gathering strength through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Its characteristic was no longer the high ideal and spiritual tendency which aim at securing the best interests of mankind, but a tendency at once egotistic, materialistic, and degrading. Princes and people no longer regarded it as their highest duty to serve the Church, and the general interests of Christendom; those who made sacrifices in a former age to secure the success of the Crusades, to found and endow charitable and religious institutions, and to build great monasteries and churches, found no imitators during these centuries. Princes professed to be engaged in patriotic projects for the honor and prosperity of their respective countries, and their subjects, following their example were entirely given to the acquisition of wealth. The idea of a Holy Alliance between the Papacy and the Empire was but ill-understood, and was daily fading from men's minds.

These considerations, together with the many blemishes on the pontificate of Boniface VIII., will afford an explanation of the violent shock, sustained in these centuries by the papal power, the effect of which was to weaken the political influence of the Holy See, and to thrust the Pope from the prominent position heretofore held by him in the councils of the Christian world. Such being now the condition of things, it became a matter of palmary importance to determine precisely and to fix permanently the *normal* limits of papal power and authority, *as guarantied by the very nature of the*

Primacy. To solve the problem, *two* different and antagonistic methods were tried—*one* by the French jailers of the Popes, and by the councils of Constance and Basle; the *other* by Pope Pius II. and his adherents, who, unable to read the signs of the times aright, attempted to regain the almost unlimited power of a bygone age.

Unfortunately, the incumbents of the papal chair, toward the close of this epoch, were either incapable or little desirous of re-establishing the Primacy on a solid and legitimate basis, and of restoring religious and social order, which had been so rudely shaken during the disastrous contest between the *papacy* and *episcopacy.*

These efforts to place the Primacy upon a *true* and *legitimate* basis; to place the Church, as it were, once more upon her feet; to give every opportunity to the development of her rich resources without either attacking or restricting the sacred rights and prerogative of the Pope; *to reform the Church in her Head and members*, occupy the interval of time between Boniface VIII. and Leo X.

CHAPTER I.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AS REGARDS HER EXTERIOR DEVELOPMENT.

Platina (Abbreviator of Pope Pius II., and, later on, Librarian of the Vatican, † 1481), Vitae Pontif. Romanor. (to Sixtus IV.), Venet. 1479, and oftener. Vitae Paparum Avenionensium, ed. *Steph. Baluz.*, Par. 1693, 2 T. 4to. The lives of all the popes of these times are found in *Muratori*, Scriptt., T. III., P. I., II. *Theodorici de Niem*, Vitae Pontiff. Romanor. 1288–1418, additis Imperatorum gestis (*Eccardi* Corp. hist. med. aevi., T. I.) Documents in *Mansi*, *Harduin* and *Raynaldi* Continuatio annal. Baron. Among the special works, *Fleury*, Hist. ecclés. (nouv. éd. Par. 1840, augmentée de quatre livres comprenant l'histoire du 15 siècle d'après un manuscrit de Fleury appartenant à la bibl. royale, T. VI.) †*Palma*, Praelectiones h. e. T. III., P. II., and T. IV. **Hefele*, A glance at the fifteenth century and its reformatory councils, especially that of Basle (in the Annals of Christian Theology and Philosophy, published at *Giessen*, Vol. IV., nro. 1. The *same*, Hist. of Councils, Vols. VI. and VII., Pt. 1. *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, Germ. transl., Vols. VIII. and IX. †*Damberger*, Synchronistic History, Vol. XII.–XV. (to 1378.) *Cantù*, Vol. VIII. (Book 13.) *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Vols. VIII. and IX. *Dönniges*, History of the German Empire during the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1840 sq., 2 div. *Lorenz*, History of Germany during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Vienna, 1863–1866, 2 vols.

THE POPES OF AVIGNON OR THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY (1309–1378).

Histoire des souverains Pontifes qui ont siégé à Avignon, Avignon, 1777, 4to. †**Christophe*, Histoire de la papauté au xiv. siècle, Paris, 1853; Germ. by *Ritter*, Paderborn, 1853, 2 vols. History of Rome during the Middle Ages, by *Papencordt*, p. 342; by *Gregorovius*, Vols. VI. and VII.; by *Reumont*, Vol. II., p. 713 sq., and Vol. III., Pt. I. †*Chavin de Malan*, History of St. Catharine of Siena, Pt. II., ch. 12 (declamatory). †**Schwab*, John Gerson, Professor of Theology and Chancellor of the University of Paris, Würzburg, 1858.

§ 266. *Translation of the Holy See to Avignon—Benedict XI.* (*October* 22, 1303, *to July* 7, 1304)—*Clement V.* (*June* 5, 1305, *to April* 20, 1314.)

Ten days after the death of Boniface VIII., Nicholas Boccasini, formerly General of the Dominicans, but then Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, was elected his successor by the unanimous vote of the Sacred College, and, as Pope, took the name of *Benedict XI.* Of a naturally gentle disposition, and inclined to peace, he withdrew the censures resting upon the Cardinals James and Peter Colonna, and upon their brothers and cousins, and Philip, King of France. He also modified considerably the bull "*Clericis laicos.*" He, however, pronounced sentence of excommunication against the leaders of the late conspiracy, but particularly against *Nogaret* and *Sciarra Colonna;* and the two Cardinals of the Colonna family were forbidden to put on the purple until further notice, a circumstance which deprived them of a vote in the conclave, after the death of Benedict,[1] who died at *Perugia*, July 7, 1304.

Philip the *Insolent*, as John von Müller calls him, availed himself of the eight months of peace, during Benedict's pontificate, to make the Holy See wholly subservient to the interests of France. By his influence, he succeeded in creating a division in the conclave. One party desired a Pope favorable to the interests of Boniface; the other, one who would promote the interests of Philip. The astute king contrived to direct the choice of the Cardinals, in the eleventh month of the Conclave, on *Bertrand de Got*, Archbishop of

---

[1] *Hefele*, The Restoration of the Colonnas, A. D. 1304. Correction of the text of the papal decree (Tübg. Quart. of Theology, 1866, nro. 3).

Bordeaux,[1] who, he *felt* sure, would be the pliant instrument of his will, notwithstanding that the Archbishop had, in the contest between him and the Pope, sided with the latter.

The new Pope took the name of *Clement V.* In spite of the remonstrances of the cardinals he persisted in remaining in France, and by his determination to be crowned at Lyons, took the initiative step to the seventy years captivity. During the solemn procession at the coronation, twelve persons were killed by the falling of a wall; Charles of Valois, the king's brother, was wounded; the Pope thrown from his horse, which Philip was leading, and, in the confusion, a precious jewel was forced from its setting in his tiara and lost. After raising many of his own relatives to ecclesiastical dignities, and servilely complying with the wishes of the French court, by recalling the bull "*Clericis laicos*," and modifying the "*Unam sanctam;*" and by restoring the Colonnas to their former offices and honors, and granting to Philip the tithes of the French Church for five years, Clement, altogether abandoning the thought of taking up his residence in the Capital of the West, in the See of St. Peter and beside the Tomb of the Apostles, went to bury himself in *Avignon* (1309), an obscure corner of Gaul, which had not even pleasant scenery and salubrity of climate to recommend it.[1] It seems Clement did not appreciate the significance of the fact that in Ancient Rome and the surrounding country, Providence had provided a temporal dominion for the Vicar of Jesus Christ, sufficiently large to secure *his independence*, and yet too small to inspire fear to other powers.[2]

---

[1] See *Christophe's* detailed researches in his history of the Papacy in the fourteenth century, in which, following the trustworthy narration of *Feretti of Vicenza*, he refutes the account of the election of Clement V. as given by *Villani* (and constantly repeated by others), who pretends that *Bertrand de Got* had a secret conference with Philip in a lonely chapel in the forest of Saint-Jean d'Angély, by which he solemnly bound himself, if elected Pope—1. To absolve Philip from all censures passed on him by Boniface VIII.; 2. To reconcile him unconditionally to the Church of Rome; 3. To grant him the tithes and revenues of France for five years; 4. To set a brand upon the memory of Boniface and to erase his name from the catalogue of popes; and, 5. To raise to the rank of cardinal candidates proposed by the French King. A sixth article was also signed, but this was to remain secret until the proper time had come for its disclosure. This compact, which would have made Clement a simoniacal pope, fortunately existed only in the fertile brain of its inventor. All writers who give it refer as their authority to Villani, the contemporary of Clement. No mention of it is to be found in any other contemporary author. *Darras*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 461. (Tr.) *Rabani*, Clement V. et Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1861. See Tübg. Quart., 1861, p. 492 sq.

He might allege in his defense that Benedict XI., unable to assert his authority amid the conflict of parties, was forced to quit Rome; that if such was the fate of one who was an Italian by birth, and had the sympathy of powerful Italian houses, much more so would it be the case with himself, who had no such claims to recommend him; and, finally, that apart from the dissensions in Rome, all Italy was torn by the quarrels of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.

A dangerous illness roused the conscience of Clement somewhat, and after his recovery he recalled the disgraceful grants of bishoprics and monasteries "*in commendam*" made by his predecessors, and steadily refused the request of Philip to erase the name of Boniface from the catalogue of Popes, and dishonor his remains, stating that an act of this importance required the authorization of an Ecumenical Council, which he would shortly convoke to meet at Lyons. In everything else, or very nearly, Clement was ready to gratify the wishes of Philip, upon whose persistent application he summoned the accusers and defenders of the late Pope, to meet before a consistory, at Avignon (1310), *even prior* to the convocation of the Ecumenical Council of Vienne, where *Nogaret*, *du Plessis*, and others drew upon themselves the indignation of those present by accusing *Boniface* of the abominable crimes of *heresy*, *idolatry*, and *unnatural lust*. The nomination of *nine French* Cardinals at one time, and *six* more shortly after, led to the belief that Clement wished to have successors who would be in sympathy with his principles, and pursue his policy.

---

[1] Avenio ventosa —— Sine vento venosa —— Cum vento fastidiosa, says a popular proverb.

[2] *Chateaubriand*, Genie du christianisme, Partie IV., livre VI., chapitre VI.: Papes et cour de Rome (ed. Paris, 1802, T. IV., p. 280). To the same effect is the celebrated passage of *Bossuet:*: "It is the will of God that the Church of Rome, the universal mother of all nations, should be dependent on none in her temporal relations, and that the Apostolic See, where all the faithful must preserve unity, should be raised above the strife of parties called forth by conflicting political claims and divergent interests." Cf. *Artaud*, Histoire de Pie VII., Paris, 1836, Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 181, and *Pacca*, Memorie storiche, Roma. 1830, Parte I., p. 13. Also *John von Müller*, History of Switz., Vol. III., c. 1: "It is absolutely necessary that the Pope should have his own capital, that he may be under the influence of no one." Cf. *Höfler*, The Popes of Avignon, the Height and Decline of their Power, being a lecture delivered in the Imperial and Royal Academy of Vienna, 1871.

Indulgent and partial to France and Frenchmen, he was haughty and severe in his relations with the princes and prelates of every other country. He placed the Venetians under interdict (1309), thus cutting them off from commercial intercourse with the rest of the Christian world, because they had taken possession of Ferrara, and offered indignities to the papal nuncios.[1] In Germany, after the death of Albert I. (of Austria), he opposed the election of Charles of Valois, brother of Philip the Fair, and supported that of the Count of Luxemburg, who, on the motion of the Archbishop of Mentz, received the votes of the electors, and took the name of Henry VII. When envoys from Henry presented themselves before the Pope, at Avignon, and promised to be faithful to the Church and defend her interests, Clement commissioned five cardinals to proceed to Rome and crown him Emperor. Henry led an expedition into Italy to restore the imperial authority there, and put a period to the strife of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.[2]

Dante, who had complained frequently and bitterly of the absence of the emperor Albert, hailed with all the ardor of his impetuous nature, the new monarch as the savior of his oppressed country, so long the prey of petty tyrants. The Ghibellines took sides with the emperor, the Guelfs with *Robert of Anjou*, whom the Pope recognized King of Naples, in 1309. In answer to Clement, who commanded the Emperor and Charles to desist from the deadly struggle in which they were now engaged, the former replied that being only protector of the Roman Church, but, unlike the King of Naples, holding no fief of the Pope, he was entirely independent of him in *temporal* affairs. It was not long, however, until the Emperor overstepped the legitimate limits of his power by declaring Charles under the ban of the Empire, and pronouncing sentence of death against him. He himself died shortly after, August 24, 1313.

---

[1] Cf. *Raynald* annal. ad ann. 1309, nros. 6 and 7.

[2] *Nicolai episc. Botrontin.* relatio de Henrici VII. itinere (*Muratori*, T. XIII.) *Berthold*, Roman Campaign of Henry of Luxemburg, 2 vols., Königsberg, 1830 sq.

King Philip, who was equally anxious to dishonor the memory of Boniface VIII., and to strike a decisive blow at the Order of the *Templars*, pressed Clement V. to convoke an Ecumenical Council at Vienne (August 12, 1308). There were many grounds of complaint against the Knights Templars. While in Palestine they had manifested a spirit of pride and insubordination in their dealings with the Patriarch of Jerusalem, a disposition to quarrel with the Knights of St. John, and had frequently shown but scant courtesy to the Popes; and after taking up their residence in France, they made themselves frequently obnoxious by their opposition to the French kings, and particularly to Philip the Fair. In the war between the houses of Aragon and Anjou, they espoused the cause of the former, and in the contest between Philip and Boniface VIII. they were among the defenders of the latter. So determined was their hostility to Philip, that they refused to pay him the tithes subsequently granted by the Pope. Moreover, the French king suspected them of complicity in the insurrection of Paris, of which the ostensible cause was the deterioration of the coin, and was only waiting a plausible pretext to suppress the Order. He would probably never have ventured to take this step had not the unprecedented privileges enjoyed by the Templars, their excessive wealth, their magnificence, and luxurious mode of living, already given great scandal, and excited the jealousy of many. Their palace in Paris, called the "*Temple*," was more spacious and splendid than any belonging to the king, and was capable of housing a large army. The opportunity so long and anxiously desired by Philip finally came, A man by the name of *Squin de Florian*, languishing in prison, promised, upon condition of obtaining his freedom, to make known some startling facts concerning the abominations practiced in the

Order, which, he said, one of his fellow-prisoners, a Templar, had revealed to him. Upon this information, the king had a number of the Templars arrested and brought to trial (1307), when, it is claimed, they admitted the truth of the charges imputed to them.

The Templars being a religious Order, were under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, and hence the necessity of proceeding cautiously in their prosecution, the more so as the Pope was at first little inclined to credit the startling and monstrous stories put in circulation against them. In the meantime, Philip resolved upon a thorough and decisive measure. On the 13th of October, 1307, in obedience to sealed orders issued to the royal officers, all the Templars of France were put under arrest, and their "*Temple*" and other property seized and confiscated. The suddenness and completeness of the measure took every one by surprise, and excited no little discontent among the people, whereupon a royal proclamation was issued, justifying the course of the king. It was here claimed that the Order was *corrupt, heretical, and immoral; that a candidate for admission into the body was first required to spit upon and trample under foot the Crucifix; to worship an idol with long hair and flaming red eyes; to deny the existence of God; and it was further asserted, that all the members were permitted to practice unnatural lust, and that, if any of their members should, in violation of his vow, have begotten a child, the infant was to be broiled, and the beard of the idol besmeared with the drippings*." Charges so monstrous and absurd, were intended, and probably calculated, to work upon the imagination of the illiterate classes, and fill them with horror of a body of men in which they were said to be perpetrated. At the commencement of these violent and illegal proceedings, Clement protested, in a bull, against the action of Philip, warning him that "he had overstepped the limits of the royal authority in constituting himself judge of the immediate subjects of the Holy See;" and, not confining himself to remonstrances alone, suspended the powers of the archbishops, bishops, and inquisitors of France, and summoned the Templars before his own tribunal for trial. When, however, the *evidence was laid before him*, he felt it his duty to consent to their imprisonment, and to order further depositions to be taken in the various dioceses throughout France. A bull (*Pastoralis praeeminentiae solio*) was accordingly issued, November 22, 1307, to this effect, but not until after the king had surrendered to the papal commissioner both the persons and the sequestered property of the Templars. The reports, as elicited both by the secular courts and canonical procedure, were conflicting and contradictory in the extreme.

While, on the one hand, it was claimed that confessions inculpating the Templars were made freely and without constraint by every officer, from the Grand Master down to the humblest in the Order, it was contended, on the other, that the torture employed to extort damnatory evidence, was so terrible in character, that, as *Aymer of Villars* afterward affirmed, he would, while undergoing its pain, and in the extremity of death, have admitted, had it been required of him, that he was the murderer of our Lord. It is, however, a little remarkable, that those professing their innocence gave no such tokens of steadfastness and adherence to principle as were exhibited by the martyrs, even among the weaker sex, in the early days of the Church. But again, it seems strange that the members of an Order bearing witness against it, should not have been brought face to face with those against whom they deposed, and that the officers, despite their frequent demands, should have been denied the privilege of appearing personally before the Pope; and it is no less strange, that those who declared both themselves and the other members of their Order guilty of abominable crimes, should have been treated with unusual and suspicious leniency. Finally, the fact that the investigations made in all other countries *except France*, were favorable to the Templars, can not be overlooked in forming a judgment of their guilt or innocence. The members of the Order examined in Spain, declared that it passed their comprehension how their brothers in France could have testified to wickedness so enormous and incredible.

After these preliminary labors, Pope Clement convoked, by the bull *Regnans in coelis*, an Ecumenical Council, at

Vienne, to give final judgment in the matter. The Council was also to set at rest forever, the question concerning *Boniface VIII.*, and to enact decrees for the *reformation of the Church in her Head and members*, as the phrase ran, in the adadmirable memorial[1] of *William Durandus*, the Younger, Bishop of Menda.

FIFTEENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (OCTOBER 16, 1311, TO MAY 6, 1312).

There were present at this Council one hundred and fourteen (not 300) archbishops and bishops, among whom were the partriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and a number of oriental prelates.[2]

Notwithstanding that many evil reports were still afloat derogatory to the reputation of Boniface,[3] the council declared the charges of immorality against him unfounded, and his memory free from taint of heresy. With regard to the Templars,[4] it yielded to the wish of the King, who professed himself ready, in case the Order were suppressed, either to apply their property and estates to defraying the expenses of a crusade or to transfer them to another military religious order; but in the meantime he was careful to keep his army encamped before the walls of Vienne, to act as a menace upon the council. Owing to the suspicious methods employed in conducting the proceedings against the Templars, the Fathers at first demanded that they should be permitted to speak personally in their own defense before the council; but, for some reason not explained, they consented, in a private consistory, held March 22, 1312, to the suppression of the Order. The bull states, however, that the suppression is not to be understood as a condemnation of the Order (*via condemnationis*), but as required by circumstances (*via provisionis*)—that is, not because the members had been proven *de jure* guilty of crimes, but because the interests of the Church demanded the suppression of their body. The disposal of their personal property and real estate was reserved to the Pope. The Fathers declared that the confessions *laid before them* were sufficient evidence of guilt. It is to be remarked, however, that while the witnesses were themselves Templars, their depositions were made, as a rule, not before papal, but royal commissioners. According to the testimony, said to have been freely given, the Templars were accused of making shipwreck of the faith, of corrupt and immoral practices, and of other crimes, for all which more definite and reliable proof has been furnished in *recent* times. Many opposed the publication of the proceedings of the trial when it finally closed, from fear that a knowledge of such crimes might accustom men to regard them with less horror, and thus eventually lead to their perpetration. In justice to the committee commissioned to

---

[1] De modo celebrandi generalis concilii, ed. *Probus*, Paris, 1545, and oftener; ed. (*Fabre*), Paris, 1671. Cf. *Bzovii*, Annal. ad an. 1311, nro. 1.

[2] The invitation to this council in the bull of April 27, 1311, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1311, nro. 26; the acts in *Mansi*, T. XXV., p. 367–426; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1321–1361. Cf. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 388 sq.

[3] For example, Card. *Nicholas*, formerly confessor to the French king, affirmed, on oath, that "on hearing of the canonization of St. Louis, the king said it was a source of general rejoicing, but many expressed a wish 'quod ejusmodi canonizatio fuisset facta ab alio Papa probo viro et Catholico bonae famae.'" Cf. *Hefele*, p. 391–415.

[4] In the bull of suppression "Ad providam Christi," in *Mansi*, T. XXV., p. 389 sq. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1340 sq. The Pope says: "Ordinis statum, habitum atque nomen, non sine cordis amaritudine et dolore et *sacro approbante concilio*, non per modum definitae sententiae, cum eam super hoc, secundum inquisitiones et processus super his habitos, *non possemus ferre de jure*, sed *per viam provisionis* seu ordinationis Apostolicae irrefragabili ac perpetuo valitura sustulimus sanctione, ipsum prohibitioni perpetuae supponentes. Universa etiam bona ordinis praelibati Apostolicae sedis ordinationi et dispositioni Apostolica auctoritate duximus reservanda." Contemporaries accused the king of desiring the suppression of the Templars, in order to secure their property, but as it was nearly all transferred to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, this seems hardly probable. *J. Bulaei* Hist. Univ. Par., T. IV., p. 110. *Natal. Alexandri* h. e. saec. XIV. diss. X. de causa Templariorum. The abolition is still taxed with injustice by *Antoninus Florent.*, in *Raynald* ad a. 1307, nr. 12, and *Trithemius* († 1516). Cf. *P. Dupuy*, Hist. de la condemnation des Templiers, Paris, 1650,

---

4to; enlarged, Brux. 1751, 4to. On the other hand, nearly every French historian of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries maintained that the guilt of the Order was established. *Raynouard*, Monumens hist. relatifs à la condamnation des chevaliers du temple, etc., Paris, 1813. *Hammer-Purgstall*, Mysterium Baphometis (the name of a symbol of the Templars) revelatum, seu fratres militiae templi, Viennae, 1818. *Raynouard* wrote answers to this work in the Journal des Savans, 1819; also *Puttrich*, Architectural Monuments of the Middle Ages in Saxony, Vol. I., Pt. III., p. 29. But the *French* sources but *lately* published, such as Procès des Templiers, etc., Paris, 1841–51, have furnished a result rather unfavorable to the Order. See *Theiner*, in the Tübing. Quart., 1832, p. 681. An English work, written by *C. C. Addison*, entitled "History of the Knights Templars," notwithstanding its manifest advocacy of the Order, accuses the Templars of a certain religious scepticism on the divinity of Christ. See also Règle et statuts *secrets* (?) des Templiers précédés de l'histoire de l'établissement, de la destruction et de la continuation moderne de l'ordre du Temple, etc., par *C. H. Maillard de Chambure*, Paris, 1841. But, despite the most searching investigations at the abolition of the Order, other statutes could not be found anywhere than those *generally* known, and adduced by us, page 704, note 1. Conf. *Palma*, Praelectiones hist. eccl., T. III., Pt. II., p. 191–210. *Soldan*, Procès des Templiers (*Raumer*, Manual of History, 1844). *Havemann*, Hist. of the Suppression of the Order of Templars, Tübg. 1846. Careful examination of all the proceedings, in *Damberger*, Vols. XII. and XIII.; especially in *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., l. c. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaedia, Vol. X., p. 716–736; French transl., Vol. 23, p. 186–208. *O. A. Haye*, Persecution of the Knights Templars, Edinburgh, 1865.

draw up the report, it must be said that a majority of their number were in favor of opening the trial anew and giving the Order the benefit of a fresh defense.

There were other matters before the Council of Vienne more directly bearing on faith and morals. The false mysticism of the *Fratricelli*, *Dulcinists*, *Beghards*, and *Beguines*, as dangerous as it was criminal, was condemned, and decrees enacted for the reformation of discipline in both male and female religious communities, for correcting the morals of the secular clergy, and for the better administration of charitable institutions, now presided over, not by the clergy, but by *laymen*. It was also ordained that a *tithe* should be levied upon all ecclesiastical benefices, during *six* years, for the support of Christians in the Holy Land, and, as has been already stated, that *Hebrew*, *Arabic*, and *Chaldaic* should be taught wherever the Roman court was held, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca.

When the Pope, in virtue of his reserved jurisdiction, finally condemned some of the most distinguished Templars to perpetual imprisonment, and among them the Grand Master, *James of Molay*, and *Guy*, the brother of the Dauphin of Auvergne and Grand-Preceptor of Narbonne, these retracted their former confessions, stating they had been extorted by violence, and protested their innocence. Molay, in his retractation, said: "Standing at the threshold of death, when the slightest deviation from truth is fraught with danger, I declare before Heaven and earth, that I have committed the most grievous of crimes, and exposed myself to a terrible death, because, mistaking the fair words of King and Pope, and wishing to escape painful torture and save my own life, I have borne false witness against my Order. I will not be brought by fear of death to give utterance to a second falsehood. If such be the price of my life, I had rather die than submit to so great an infamy." Guy of Auvergne made a similar recantation. Their example, however, was not followed by their fellow-prisoners, Hugh Peyraud, Visitor of France, and Geoffrey of Gonneville, Preceptor of Aquitaine, who steadily maintained the truth of their first assertions. The tardiness of a legal process little accorded with the impetuous temper of Philip, who, hearing of the action of the two Templars, had them dragged away, while the judges were still deliberating on their fate, to an island of the Seine, situated where the present Pont-Neuf crosses that river, and there burnt alive (March 18, 1314). This was but of a piece with the arbitrary acts of Philip during the years 1310 and 1311, as exemplified in the death of fifty-nine Templars, who, refusing to confess the truth of the crimes imputed to the Order, were adjudged worthy of death by their declared enemy *Philip Marigny*, Archbishop of Sens, and, by the king's order, burnt alive in Paris, near Porte Saint Antoine. Both the king and the Pope died shortly after the execution of Molay and Guy—the latter, April 20, and the former, September 29, 1314. Their death occurring so shortly after the suppression of the Templars, was regarded by some as a visitation of Providence. Since all the acts of the Council of Vienne have not been preserved, and of those that have come down to us, many passages have been falsified, it is impossible to obtain an authentic statement of the affairs of the Templars, and the verdict of history in their regard is consequently the reverse of uniform.

King Philip was succeeded by his eldest son, *Louis X.*, surnamed the Brawler (*le Hutin*).

§ 267. *John XXII.* (*August* 7, 1316, *to December* 4, 1334)—*Benedict XII.* (*December* 20, 1334, *to April* 25, 1342)—*Clement VI.* (*May* 7, 1342, *to December* 6, 1352)—*Struggle with Louis the Bavarian.*

Chronicon Ludov. IV. imp. (*Pezii* Scriptt. Aust., T. II., p. 415.) *Henrici de Rebdorf* Chronica, 1295–1363. *Freheri* Scriptt. Germ. ed. Struve, T. I., p. 598. *Gualvanei de la Flamma*, De reb. gestis a vicecomitib. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. XII.) *Viti Arnpeckhii* Chronicon Bavar. (*Pezii* Thesaur. anecdot., T. III., Pt. III.) *Christophe*, l. c. (Germ. by *Ritter*, Vol. II., p. 1–28.) *Herwart ab Hohenburg*, Ludov. IV. imp. defensus contra *Bzovium* (Annal. eccl., T. I., P. I., p. 412 sq.), Monach. 1618, 4to. *Gewoldi* defensio Ludov. IV. imp., Ingolst. 1618, 4to. *Olenschläger*, Polit. Hist. of the Roman Empire during the first half of the fourteenth century, Frankfort, 1755, 4to. The works of *Weech* and *Schreiber*.

After the death of Clement, the Holy See remained vacant two years. A conclave was held at Lyons, where, after a protracted and bitter struggle between the Italian and French cardinals, the choice finally fell upon James of Ossa, a native of Cahors, and at the time of his promotion, Cardinal-bishop of Porto, who took the name of *John XXII.* Villani, the Florentine statesman, represents this Pope as a religiously minded man, versed in theology and canon law, a promoter of learning, friendly to the universities, of a penetrating mind, and pursuing an enlightened policy in all important affairs. As he at once took up his residence at *Avignon,* laid the foundation of a papal palace, and created at one time out of eight, *seven* French cardinals and one Italian, it was evident he had made up his mind to follow in the footsteps of his immediate predecessor. He possessed a marvelous capacity for the administration of public affairs.[1] Notwithstanding that he was dependent on France, he offered (1317) his mediation between Frederic, Duke of Austria, and Louis of Bavaria, who, after the death of Henry VII., had taken up arms against each other for the possession of the empire. Grounding himself on precedent, he announced that during the vacancy of the empire, the administration of the Italian provinces appertaining to it, belonged to the Pope, and that consequently, *he alone* had the right of nominating an imperial vicar in Italy. Pope John confirmed in this office Robert of Naples, whom Clement had appointed in 1314, after the death of the emperor, Henry VII., but the Ghibelline vicars, appointed by the emperor previously to his death, now used their power to oppress the Guelfs. The Pope threatened them with excommunication, if they would not at once relinquish all pretensions to the vicariate and recognize Robert, whom he now authorized to hold the office until after the coronation of the Emperor. Frederic of Austria was captured by *Louis the Bavarian,* at the battle of Mühldorf, in 1322, after which the latter, without consulting the Pope, assumed the title of King of the Romans, and hastened to send aid to the already defeated Ghibellines. The indignant Pontiff, by a bull, issued October 8, 1323, required Louis, inasmuch as doubtful elections were to be referred to the Holy See, to leave off the exercise of all imperial functions and appear personally before him within three months.[2] Louis, feigning compliance with the papal command, sent an embassy, requesting a prolongation of the period within which he was to appear, but at the same time protested at the diet of Nürnberg against the right claimed by the Pope, stating that he recognized the electoral vote as the only source and sanction of his authority. The Pope granted an extension of time to Louis, but the latter, now assuming an aggressive tone, charged the former with protecting heresy, and disturbing the public peace, and was, in consequence, excommunicated, and his empire laid under interdict (October 1, 1324). Louis retaliated, somewhat in the spirit of Henry IV. and Philip the Fair, by the publication of a memorial, in which the Pope was styled "*the so-called Pope John*, an enemy of the public peace, a heretic, the destroyer of the rights of princes, and the author of all the evils which then afflicted and desolated Germany and Italy." An angry and *acrimonious correspondence* was now opened between them,[1] in the course of which it became abundantly evident that the isolated instances of the arbitrary exercise of authority by a few of the last occupants of the Holy See, but notably their *partiality for France*, had considerably diminished the prestige of the Chair of Peter, and evoked throughout Christendom feelings of indifference and distrust toward it. The publication of the papal censures by Burchard, Archbishop of Magdeburg, cost that prelate his life; and the three ecclesiastical electors, regardless of the papal excommunication, took part in the celebration of Louis' espousals.

---

[1] The Regests compiled from his public acts fill 59 vols., containing 60,000 documents, whilst those of *Clement V.* fill but 7 vols., containing 7,248 letters. Cf. *Dudik,* Iter Rom., Vienna, 1855, T. II., p. 46.

[2] The bull is in *Raynald.* ad an. 1323, nro. 30, and more complete in *Herwart,* loc. cit., Pt. I., p. 194. The protest of Louis at Nürnberg is in *Herwart,* Pt. I., p. 248, and in *Olenschlaeger's* Archives, p. 84. Cf. *von Weech,* Emperor Louis the Bavarian, and King John of Bohemia, with documentary proofs, Munich, 1860. By the *same,* Sixty Documents of Emperor Louis the Bavarian, Munich, 1863.

In enumerating the enemies of the Pope, the names of two doctors of the University of Paris should not be omitted—viz., *Marsilius of Padua* (*de Raymundinis*), who died in 1328, and his assistant, *John of Jandun* († P. A. D. 1338), both of whom were likely under the influence of *Ubertino of Casale*, one of the Spiritualists or Fratricelli (*Spirituales*) whom the Pope had already condemned. Besides, there were *Hangenoer of Augsburg*, private secretary to the emperor; and, above all, *William Occam* (1342), provincial of the condemned Minorites, and in sympathy with them; to whom may be added the more moderate Dominican, *John of Paris*, and *Lupold of Bebenberg*, Bishop of Bamberg († 1354), who, however, labored strenuously to preserve the respect for papal authority so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people. In the work entitled "*Defensor pacis*," of which Marsilius and John of Jandun were the chief authors, it was maintained that all legislative and judicial authority in the Church resided primarily *in the people*, through whom it was transmitted in trust to the clergy; that all distinctions of rank in the hierarchy derived their origin from the ambition of bishops; that the body of the faithful, through their representative, the emperor, had conferred the primacy on the See of Rome as a matter of convenience and expediency; that the primacy originally implied no more than the right of convoking general councils; and, finally, that the emperor was the proprietor of all church property, and that he alone might appoint or depose a pope, according to his good pleasure. *Occam* did not at first go quite this length. On the whole, he advocated the principles set forth in the "*Monarchia*" of Dante (1321), and, being familiar with classical antiquity, was indebted to this source for the development of his *theory of State power*, so antagonistic to Christian ideas. He denied that the popes had any political rights over the Roman States, maintaining that the absolute power over the whole world claimed and enjoyed by the Roman emperors, and derived immediately from God, had passed in its fullness down to their successors. To demonstrate that the dignity of the king of the Romans was identical with that of the Roman emperors, Occam took every liberty with historical facts, distorting such as he did not discard. *Election in itself*, said he, *even without coronation by the Pope*, conveys sovereign and unlimited power. Nay, more, the emperor has the right both of appointing and judging popes and of convoking ecumenical councils. When his teachings were condemned, Occam, instead of submitting, was so far carried away by polemical pride as to strike at the very root of ecclesiastical authority by denying the infallibility of ecumenical councils.

---

[1] The first symptoms of ill-will between the two powers which had heretofore gone on so harmoniously is already apparent in *Dante*, Purgator., canto xvi., v. 106–129; *Joannes de Parrhisiis* (Dominican, † 1304), De potestate regia et papali (in *Goldasti* Monarchia S. Rom. Imp., Frcft. 1611 sq.) (III. T., T. II., 96 and 108), where are also found the other writings *in favor of the emperor*. Cf. *Wm. Schreiber*, The Polit. and Relig. Doctrines prevalent under Louis the Bavarian, Lps. 1858.

Lupold of Bebenberg (Bamberg), though not so extreme in his principles or so violent in his advocacy of them as Occam, still pursued the same general line of argument, and in his treatise "*De juribus regni et imperii Romanorum*" attempted to show that the Roman empire was wholly independent of the Church. These imperial pretensions to unlimited power naturally called forth counter-claims from the advocates of papal *supremacy*, which, according to the ingenious computation of a certain glosser upon canon law, transcends the imperial dignity precisely fifty-seven times.[1] An Augustinian hermit of Ancona, named *Augustino Triomfi* (*Augustinus Triumphus*) († 1328), and a Franciscan, named *Alvarus Pelagius* († P. A. D. 1340), defended the following propositions: The Pope alone holds his authority immediately from God. Emperors and all other sovereigns hold theirs from the Pope. The Pope *can, of his own right, name the emperor*, and withdraw, if it please him, from the electors the electoral franchise granted them. The emperor-elect can not legally exercise the functions of the imperial government until after his election has been confirmed and he himself crowned by the Pope, although he may at once administer the affairs of Germany. Finally, *the Pope has the right of directly nominating the emperor, either by hereditary succession or by electoral vote.*[1]

---

[1] A parallelism between the papacy and the empire and the sun and moon is drawn out in the Glossa ad cap. Solitae, 6. De majoritate et obedientia, where it is said: "Igitur cum terra sit septies major luna, sol autem octies est major terra, constat ergo ut pontificalis dignitas quinquagesies septies sit major regali dignitate, etc." Cf. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., p. 183.

Extravagant claims such as these were little calculated to conciliate hostile minds, or to set at rest doubts concerning the authority of the Holy See. Even the most zealous advocates of the ancient order of things began to fear that the growing discontent would eventually work the ruin of the supremacy of the Pope. This is evident from a much later work by the canon *Peter of Andlau* († 1475),[2] who, despite his ardent attachment to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, could not conceal his fears that he was performing a useless labor in defending it.

Louis of Bavaria, after his reconciliation with Frederic of Austria, led his army to Milan (1327), where he was crowned King of Lombardy, and thence proceeding to Rome, accompanied by a number of schismatical bishops and monks, practically carried out the teachings of his partisans and defenders. Arrived at Rome, he received the imperial crown from the hands of Sciarra Colonna, "*Capitano del popolo,*" and was anointed by two of the schismatical bishops. He next conferred the rank of Senator upon Castruccio, the despot of Lucca, and named Marsilius of Padua vicar of the Roman States. His orthodoxy was so very pure and his patriotism so sensitive that he decreed the death-penalty against those guilty of the crimes of heresy and high-treason.[3] Finally, on the 14th of April, 1328, proceeding to the great square of St. Peter's Church, surrounded by all the pomp and circumstance of imperial authority, he ascended a raised throne and ordered his chancellor to read a proclamation, which, after denouncing the Pope as guilty of high-treason, went on to declare that "the priest James of Cahors, who styles himself Pope John XXII., is hereby deposed from the papacy and from every other ecclesiastical rank and dignity, and ordered to be handed over to the imperial officers, to be punished as a heretic." To complete the sacrilegious farce, Louis had only to create an antipope. Accordingly, four days later, the Romans were again summoned to the great square of St. Peter's. Two thrones were erected side by side on the steps of the Church, one of which was occupied by the Emperor, and the other by Pietro Rainalducci of Corbario, in the diocese of Rieti, one of the Fratricellian Spiritualists, upon whose finger the Emperor put the Fisherman's ring, and whom he named Pope *Nicholas V.* Nicholas was the last of the *imperial* antipopes, and Louis the last of the German Emperors, who incurred sentence of excommunication.

---

[1] *Augustinus Triumphus,* Summa de potestate ecclesiastica ad Joh. Pap. XXII. Aug., Vind. 1473; Rom. 1582. *Alvarus Pelagius,* De planctu ecclesiae. libb. II., Ulm., 1474; Ven. 1560 f. Cf. *Schwab,* Gerson, p. 24 sq.

[2] De imperio Romano, Regis et Augusti creatione, inauguratione, administratione; officio et potestate Electorum, etc., libb. II., ed cum notis *Marq. Freheri,* Argent. 1603–12; Norimb. 1657. Cf. *Buss,* in the Freiburg Periodical, Vol. IV., p. 413–416.

[3] *Ficker,* Documents supplementary to the history of the Roman campaign of Louis the Bavarian, Innsbruck, 1865. *Kopp,* Frederic and Louis, the two kings in opposition, Brl. 1865.

Louis' triumph was of short duration. On the following day, James Colonna read publicly the sentence of excommunication against Louis, and barely escaped with his life from the vengeance of the imperial guards, thus, in a measure, expiating by this act of courageous devotion to the Holy See, the former misdeeds of his house. Warned by the near approach of Robert, King of Naples, at the head of a victorious army, Louis and his antipope fled from Rome amid the derisive shouts of an indignant populace. Most of the Italian cities and many of the Ghibelline leaders forsook his cause, and sought a reconciliation with the Pope. The antipope, who had been left at Pisa to provide for himself as best he could, being obliged to fly from that city, hastened to Avignon, publicly confessed his faults, and threw himself upon the mercy of John XXII., who gave him the kiss of peace, and treated him until his death, in 1333, with kindness and consideration.

The interdict, which followed the excommunication of Louis, produced so powerful a reaction against him in Germany, that he made every effort, after the year 1330, to have it removed. He engaged John, King of Bohemia, and Baldwin, Archbishop of Treves, to interpose in his behalf, and through them made the most humble and conciliatory advances to the Pope,[1] who, however, refused to listen to any terms recognizing his title to the imperial throne. Despairing of an accommodation, Louis at length privately proposed to resign in favor of his cousin Henry, Duke of Lower Bavaria, but through the imprudence of the latter in divulging the secret, was led to withdraw the proposal and maintain himself at every risk. He at once proceeded to extremities against the Pope. Allying himself to the chief of the Spiritualists, he sought, through the coöperation of Cardinal Napoleon Orsini, to convoke a general council before which the Pope was to have been arraigned for *heresy* and deposed. It seems that in *some of his sermons*, John XXII. had expressed the opinion, much in favor in the Eastern Church, that departed souls would not enjoy the intuitive vision of God until after the general judgment and resurrection of the body. The Dominican Order and the University of Paris promptly rejected the opinion. In the meantime John died (December 4, 1334), leaving a well-filled exchequer, whose wealth, amounting to eighteen millions of gold florins and seven millions in jewels, was derived chiefly from *annats*, or the first year's revenue of a vacant bishopric; from *expectancies*, or moneys paid by clerics to the Pope for letters securing them the first beneficies that should fall vacant; and from the *tithe*, or a levy amounting to the tenth of its value on all property. It was said that the Pope was accumulating this wealth to undertake a new crusade, and to put him in a position to restore the pontifical residence to Rome.

---

[1] *Dominicus*, Baldwin of Luxemburg, Archbishop of Treves, Coblenz, 1862.

In answer to the imputation of heresy, John replied that he had simply given the opinion for what it was worth, without intending to put it forward as his own belief, and when, on his death-bed, he made a public profession of the orthodox faith, concerning the beatific vision, saying, *that the purified souls enjoy the company of Christ, and the fellowship of the angels in Heaven, where they see God face to face.*"

He was succeeded by Cardinal James Fournier, a Cistercian monk, as *Benedict XII.*, who at once set about reforming the papal household, strengthening the discipline and correcting the morals of monks and the secular clergy,[1] and reducing the imposts which had grown so burdensome as to excite universal complaint. By the bull "*Benedictus Deus*," issued February 4, 1336, he set at rest the question of the intuitive vision, defining that "just souls, having no guilt to expiate, enjoy it immediately after death." Though desirous of being free from the influence of the French court, and meditating a return to Rome, he nevertheless completed the papal palace at Avignon, commenced by his predecessor. He was disposed to treat Louis justly, if not kindly, and the latter reciprocated by proposing, in 1335, to accede to any terms that could be fairly required of him. Benedict, however, found it impossible to entirely overcome the baneful influence of the French cardinals and the courts of France and Naples. Everything was put in the way of a reconciliation with Louis, and the well-meaning Pontiff could do no more to alleviate the sufferings of Germany than to abstain from publishing any further censures against her monarch. When it became known that the Pope was favorably inclined to Louis, the *Electors* met at *Frankfort* (1338), declared the Emperor innocent of the charges that had occasioned the interdict, and pronounced any ecclesiastic, who should observe its provisions, a disturber of the public peace.[1] Shortly after the Electors, falling into the mistake of previous writers, in confounding the Emperor's office as protector of the Church with his dignity of King of the Germans, came together in the diet of *Rhense*[2] (July 15, 1338), and drew up and published a decree, affirming that "the imperial dignity is derived immediately from God; that election is the sole title to imperial authority; that a papal confirmation is derogatory to the majesty of the Empire; and that whosoever holds differently shall be adjudged guilty of high-treason." The controversy grew in heat and acrimony, and among the advocates of the imperial party, the most notorious and vehement was the perfidious *William of Occam*. Louis was perhaps the worst enemy to his own cause, by his unwarrantable aggressions upon the most sacred of ecclesiastical rights. He, of his own *au-*

---

[1] Ordinationes et Reformationes, etc., in Bullario magno, T. I., p. 242 sq., and Constitutio totius ordin. Canonicor. regulae ord. Sti. Aug., ibid., p. 259.

---

[1] *First Assembly of Electors and Princes*, in *Gewold*, l. c., p. 146; *Olenschlaeger's* Archives, p. 188.

[2] Not *Reuss*, as *Darras* has in his Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 492.

thority, granted a *divorce* to Margaret Maultasch, Duchess of Carinthia and Countess of Tyrol, from her marriage with prince John Henry, son of the King of Bohemia, and *a dispensation from the impediment of kindred*, between her and his own son, the Marquis of Brandenburg, and had their union solemnized with royal pomp and splendor, in 1340. From the extreme of arrogance he passed to the extreme of pusillanimous fear, thus placing an impassable barrier between himself and the Pope on the one hand, and on the other alienating forever the popular sympathy, a large measure of which he had thus far enjoyed.[1]

Benedict's successor, *Clement VI.*, a man of extravagant and luxurious habits, was now in a position to act more energetically against Louis, while the electors, on the other hand, assailed him with the most bitter reproaches. He was commanded, by a bull dated April, 1343, to appear before the Pope at Avignon, and finding himself deserted by his friends, he signed a document by which he promised, among other things, to acknowledge that he had obtained the empire by unjust means, to recall all his acts as Emperor, and to receive whatever penance the Pope might inflict upon him. This proving unsatisfactory at Avignon, he was further required to recall all he had done as King of Germany, and to promise to take no further step in public affairs unless with the approbation of the Pope. At a diet held at Frankfort in September, 1344, these conditions were declared degrading to the Emperor, and ruinous to the Empire, and it was resolved that Louis should not again seek absolution from his censures. Clement, impatient of the vacillating conduct of Louis, published, on Holy Thursday of the year 1346, a bull against him, containing all the terrible forms of *Jewish* imprecation,[2] and an exhortation to the Electors to choose as their king, Charles, Margrave of Moravia, son of John, King of Bohemia. This prince was in fact elected King of the Romans, by the five electors, at the diet of Rhense,[1] and crowned at Bonn, in 1346, under the title of Charles IV. But the intrigue and corruption by which the votes were procured, excited so much indignation that the new King was forced to take refuge in France. Even after the death of Louis, who was stricken with apoplexy, October 11, 1347, while taking part in a chase, Charles, though bearing with him the papal absolution for Germany, was unfavorably received. His claims were opposed by *Günther of Schwarzburg*, and were not admitted until after he had been a second time elected at Frankfort, and crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, in July, 1349.

---

[1] Tota terra illud matrimonium multifariam multisque modis diris vocibus inculpavit, says *Joh. Vitoduran.* Chron. ad a. 1342.

[2] Conf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1346, nr. 3 sq. The excommunication contains the following words: "Veniat ei laqueus, quem ignorat, et cadat in ipsum. Sit maledictus ingrediens, sit maledictus egrediens. Percutiat eum Dominus amentia et caecitate ac mentis furore. Coelum super eum fulgura mittat. Omnipotentis Dei ira et beatorum Petri et Pauli, quorum ecclesiam praesumpsit et praesumit suo posse confundere, in hoc et futuro saeculo exardescat in ipsum. Orbis ter-

When the schismatical Minorites, headed by *William of Occam*, were deprived of their protector, they immediately abjured their errors. Danger now menaced the papacy from another quarter. Clement, apart from his extravagant habits and love of splendor, was also open to the charge of nepotism. Of ten cardinals created by him, there were *nine Frenchmen*, five of whom were his own *nephews*, and only one Italian. His *purchase* of the city of *Avignon*, belonging to Joanna, the impoverished Queen of Naples,[2] for the sum of eighty thousand gold florins, seemed to indicate a purpose of permanently fixing the residence of the Pope in France. In spite of acts such as these, so destructive to papal authority, Clement VI. succeeded by his mediation in partially establishing friendly relations between England and France, Hungary and Naples, and the cities of Venice and Genoa.

§ 268. *Innocent VI.* (A. D. 1352–1362)—*Bl. Urban V.* (A. D. 1362–1370)—*Gregory XI.* (A. D. 1370–1378.)

Clement VI. was succeeded by the pious, upright, and austere Stephen Aubert, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, formerly professor of civil law at Toulouse, under the name of *Innocent VI.* A

---

rarum pugnet contra eum; aperiatur terra et ipsum absorbeat vivum. In generatione una deleatur nomen ejus, et dispereat de terra memoria ejus, etc."

[1] Not Rheims, as *Darras* erroneously says in his Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 500.

[2] See the document in *Bzovius*, Annal. ecclesiast. ad an. 1348, nro. 10, and *Leibnitii* Cod. jur. gent., Pt. I., p. 200.

reduction of the burdensome taxes levied by his predecessors had become indispensable, and, to make the measure practicable, he brought the expenses of his court within the limits of the most rigid economy. He also banished from the city a crowd of abandoned women, commanded the cardinals to live less extravagantly, and checked a tendency, now beginning to manifest itself among them, to constitute themselves an exclusive, independent, and *autocratic* body. Previously to his election, they had *severally signed a document* binding themselves, under oath, that whosoever should be elected to the papacy should not raise the number of cardinals above twenty; should not deprive a cardinal of his dignity or imprison him without the assent of two-thirds of the college, nor create new cardinals, nor confer the higher ecclesiastical offices either in the Roman Church or States, nor grant ecclesiastical tithes and subsidies, unless with the same assent; and, finally, prescribing that one-half of the revenues of the Roman Church should be given to them.[1] These articles were declared by Innocent, who had subscribed to them with the condition, "as far as they may be conformable to the laws of the Church," to be null and void.

The exterior policy of Innocent, and his relations to princes, particularly to Peter the Cruel of Castile, were marked with characteristic prudence and a just appreciation of the great changes that had been effected in public opinion. Individuals were indeed excommunicated, and countries laid under interdict, but never without just and sufficient cause; and it must be said, to his honor and credit, that he was strictly impartial in the exercise of his office, as his many public acts abundantly testify.

In Italy, republican leaders were still dreaming of recalling from out the depths of the distant past the splendors of heathen Rome, and of again making that once proud city the mistress of the world. In the States of the Church, and particularly in Rome, the absence of papal and the impotency of imperial authority afforded a good opportunity for Utopian dreamers to put forth their fine theories of ideal freedom, by which the people were carried to the extremes of absurdity, and, at times, to the confines of madness.

---

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., *Cox's* trans., p. 124. (Tr.)

In 1347, the tribune of the people, *Cola di Rienzi*,[1] with the aid of the papal vicar, *Raymond of Orvieto*, putting himself at the head of the Roman citizens, at a time when lawlessness, party feuds, and every sort of disorder were riot in the city, succeeded in establishing the forms of the ancient Roman Republic,[2] restoring order, peace, and strict justice, and restraining the wild excesses practiced by the members and partisans of the degenerate houses of the Colonnas, Orsinis, and Savellis. His sudden elevation was too much for him. His vanity outran his judgment, and he was so insanely foolish as to summon the Pope, to whom he had sworn obedience, the College of Cardinals, the two rival German emperors, Louis and Charles, and the German electors, to appear before a tribunal of the Roman people. He was excommunicated by the papal legate, Cardinal Bertrand de Deux, in December, 1347, and forced to fly the city. He shortly obtained permission to return, was appointed senator by the Pope, and once more established himself in the public favor; but he again indulged in his foolish excesses, excited the hatred and contempt of all classes, and was finally slain in a tumult, in 1354.

In the meantime the States of the Church had fallen under the power of a number of petty despots, whom Innocent now resolved to displace. Accordingly, in 1353, he sent a considerable army into Italy, under the warlike Cardinal *Albornoz*, through whose tactics and diplomatic skill the papal authority was soon reëstablished.[3] In the following year (1354),

---

[1] †*Papencordt*, Cola di Rienzi and his Age, from unpublished sources, Hamburg, 1841, sketches a rather flattering pen-picture of the tribune *at the beginning* of his public career. *Schlosser-Kriegk* present the reverse of it in their Univ. Hist., Vol. VIII., p. 190 sq. and p. 207 sq. The *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. XX., p. 469 sq. *Christophe*, Hist. of the Papacy during the fourteenth century, Vol. II., p. 111 sq.

[2] On the first day of Lent, 1347, Cola affixed to the door of *San Giorgio in Velabro* (the only church in Rome dedicated to the tutelary saint of England) his celebrated notice announcing the speedy return of the Good Estate: *In breve tempo li Romani torneranno al loro antico buono stato.* (Tr.)

[3] *Lescale*, Vie du grand cardinal Albornoz, Paris, 1629. *Christophe*, Vol. II., p. 175 sq.

Charles IV. led a small force into Italy, but for the purpose of receiving the royal and imperial crowns rather than with any intention of maintaining his rights. He received the iron crown from the hands of the Archbishop of Milan, February 6, 1355, and was crowned Emperor on the 5th of the following April, at Rome, by the cardinals Albornoz and Bertrandi. But the enthusiasm of the Romans, in anticipation of a revival of the past, and the apostrophe of *Petrarca*—"Let the new Augustus return to Italy; let Rome once more behold her bridegroom, and Italy kiss his feet"—were without effect on Charles. He refused to go to Rome, and continued to maintain friendly relations with the Pope.

Innocent, apart from his nepotism and his partiality for the French, from among whom he exclusively chose his candidates for the Sacred College, possessed many and striking virtues, to which full justice was done after his death.[1]

He was succeeded by the abbot of the monastery of St. Victor, at Marseilles, under the name of *Urban V.*, who cultivated, as Pope, the virtues that had distinguished him as a monk. He at once expressed his purpose of restoring the papal residence to Rome, and *Petrarca*, to strengthen his resolution, asked him "if he would not prefer to rise from death to life in the company of the Apostles and Martyrs of Rome, rather than among the sinners of Avignon?" To revive decaying discipline and check corruption in the Church, he enacted severe laws against the vices of simony and concubinage, forbade extravagance in dress, enforced the duty of residence, and prescribed that provincial synods should be regularly held.

The predecessors of Urban had been long engaged in a vexatious conflict against *Barnabo Visconti*, the despot of Milan, who, however, defied all their efforts, and laughed at ecclesiastical censures, boasting that within his own dominions he was emperor, pope, and God. Urban now launched against him the severest anathemas of the Church, rapidly following them up by a crusade (1363). While carrying on the war with all his might, and putting forth every energy to achieve success, Urban was ever ready to listen to proposals of peace (1364).[1] But to reëstablish a firm and lasting peace throughout the whole of Italy, all were agreed required the presence of the Pope in Rome, and Urban, fully realizing the truth of the general conviction, returned to Italy, and *entered Rome* (1367), in triumph, amid the joyful acclamations of a grateful people, who, for sixty years, had not gazed upon the successor of St. Peter. Many of the cardinals, on leaving France for the Eternal City, complained that they were going into exile.[2]

---

[1] By the bull "*De Festo Lanceae et Clavorum Domini*," he instituted the several feasts of the various Instruments of the Passion. (Tr.)

The Emperor Charles, who had, in 1365, visited the Pope, at Avignon, and offered to subdue Barnabo Visconti, now crossed the Alps at the head of a considerable army, and obliged that turbulent despot to accept the terms of peace already offered him by Urban. It seemed for a time as if harmony and good-will were again restored between Church and State in Italy, but it was only a brief interval of calm, to be shortly succeeded by the violence of the storm. The Emperor, after going to meet the Pope at Viterbo, went in advance of him to Rome, where he met him outside the gate, and, according to the time-honored custom, seizing the bridle of his horse, conducted him into the city. Urban reciprocated the Emperor's services by conferring upon his consort the crown of Empress.[3] In the same year, the Greek Emperor, *John Palaeologus*, came to Rome, for the twofold purpose of reëstablishing the union between the two Churches of the East and the West, and of securing aid against the aggressions of the Turks. The Pope did indeed attempt to organize a crusade for the East, but the enthusiasm which had once set the martial fires of the West aglow, and thronged the highways of Eastern Europe with great armies, pushing on to the Holy Land, had cooled forever the hearts of Europeans.

---

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1364, nro. 3.

[2] *Christophe*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 251 sq. *L'Abbé Magnan*, Histoire d'Urbain V. et son siècle d'après les manuscrits du Vatican, ed. II., Paris, 1863. Cf. Tübg. Quart. 1866, p. 459 sq.

[3] Another proof of the fact is to be found in the prayer, addressed by *Charles* to the following Pope, asking permission to have his son, Wenceslaus, chosen King of the Romans: "Cum autem ad hujusmodi electionis celebrationem nobis viventibus procedi non valeat sine vestro beneplacito, assensu et gratia ac favore, beatitudini vestrae reverenter et humiliter supplicamus, quatenus cum dicti electores dispositi sint de nostro consensu electionem hujusmodi de rege celebrare praefato, etc." Gregory XI. answers: "Nos super praemissis saepius cogitavimus et cum fratribus nostris collationem habuimus diligentem, et licet electio hujusmodi te vivente minime de jure possit aut debeat celebrari, sperantes tamen publicam utilitatem ex hujusmodi electionis et ejus effectu (dante Deo) proventuram, ut electio praedicta modo praemisso hac vice duntaxat valeat celebrari, nostrum beneplacitum, assensum ac favorem et gratiam auctoritate apostolica tenore praesentium impertimur." *Raynald.* ad an. 1376, nro. 13.

No sooner had the Emperor Charles IV. departed, than the situation of Urban became critical in the extreme. After a nomination of cardinals at Montefiascone, in 1368, when out of eight raised to the purple, there was only one Englishman and one Italian, while there were *six* Frenchmen, thus giving the latter a preponderance of influence in the College, it was determined, in spite of the tears and entreaties of the pious Franciscan, *Pedro*, prince of Aragon, and of the illustrious Swedish princess, *St. Bridget*,[1] to again transfer the papal residence to Avignon, September 16, 1370. St. Bridget had warned the Pope that if he returned to France he would not long live to enjoy the peace and quiet of Avignon, and the event verified the prediction, for Urban survived his departure from Rome barely three months. He died December 19, 1370.

The virtues of Urban, which have merited for him the title of *Saint*, would have done honor to a better age.

He was succeeded by Cardinal Roger, the youthful nephew of Clement VI., a proficient jurist, and a humble and exemplary priest, under the title of *Gregory XI.* The fact of his creating eighteen French cardinals shortly after his accession, did not promise well for the future of the Church. He was called to Italy, however, earlier than he had anticipated, by the revolt of *Barnabo Visconti*, and his brother *Galeazzo* (1372), and by the efforts made by very nearly all the cities of the States of the Church to throw off their allegiance to the Pope, and ally themselves to the Florentines. *Catharine*

---

[1] Conf. *Brigittae* († 1373) revelationum lib. IV., c. 139–143, ed. et recogn. *Joan de Turrecremata*, Rom. 1488, 1521. Life of St. Bridget of Sweden, by a Sister of the Perpetual Adoration, Mentz, 1875. (Tr.)

of Siena, the saintly and influential Dominican nun, had much to do with the return of the Pope to Rome. Visiting Avignon, chiefly for the purpose of negotiating a peace for the Florentines,[1] she insisted on the transference of the Holy See to Italy, and added not a little to the persuasiveness of her appeal by her sincerity, earnestness, and ardor, and by her *miraculous* gift, which enabled her, shortly after her arrival, to lay open the actual condition of the papal court. Persuaded on which side his duty lay, Gregory, accompanied by the whole Sacred College, except six who remained behind, proceeded to Rome, in January, 1377, only to find the States of the Church in the utmost disorder, and Rome itself anything but a secure place of abode. Feeling ran so high in Florence, the source of all the difficulties, that St. Catharine of Siena, who had been sent thither by the Pope, to mediate a peace, succeeded only at the peril of her life in appeasing the popular fury.[2] Negotiations were broken off by the death of Gregory, the last of the French Popes, but were shortly resumed and brought to a successful termination.

The popes of Avignon completed the codification of canon law.[3] The last authentic collection (*Lib. V. Clementinarum*), comprising the canons of the Council of Vienne and some others, was compiled under *Clement V.* The constitutions, which made their appearance later on, formed a separate collection, under the title of *Extravagantes* (*Extravagantes Joannis XXII.*, divided into fourteen titles, and seventy-four *Extravagantes communes*, arranged in five books).[4] These were subsequently incorporated into the *Corpus juris* of *John Chapuis* (Paris, 1499).[5]

---

[1] Cf. *Vita St. Catharinae*, by her confessor, *Raymundus Capuanus*, P. III., c. 8. (*Bolland.* Acta SS. m. April, T. III., p. 956 sq.) *Chavin de Malan*, Biography of St. Catharine of Siena, transl. from the Fr. into Germ., Ratisbon, 1847 (declamatory, and gloryfying the popedom of Avignon). *Alfonso Capecelatro*, Life of St. Catharine, 2 ed., Florence, 1859. Le lettere di Sta. Caterina dà Siena con proemio e Note di *Nic. Tommaseo*, Firenze, 1860 (the Notes nave often a young Italian coloring). *Hase*, Caterina of Siena, being the picture of a saint, 1864 (the composition is of a Protestant rationalistic cast, but the coloring is brilliant).

[2] *Bolland.*, l. c., p. 957.

[3] See § 227.

[4] Cf. *Bickell*, On the origin and actual use of the *Extravagantes* in the Corpus juris canonici, Marburg, 1825. See *Walter*, Text-book of Canon Law, 13 ed., p. 205 sq., and *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. IV., p. 373 sq.

[5] Cf. *Maassen*, Sources and Works of Canon Law, Vol. II.

Unfortunately for the Holy See, its loss of independence and its subordination to French influence, to the exclusion and detriment of other nations, weakened the confidence that had heretofore been reposed in the Head of the Church. Again, the great number of burdensome and arbitrary levies, known as *reservations*, *commends*, *annats* (*fructus medii temporis*, *primi anni*), confirmation fees, and contributions for carrying on the Crusades, which now had assumed the proportions of a *tithe;* and the repulsive picture, drawn by *Petrarca*, an eye-witness, of the scandals of Avignon, to which the fullest credence was given by *Villani*, the Florentine statesman, and *Antoninus*, also a Florentine, largely contributed to destroy respect for the papacy and to weaken the authority of the Holy See. The efforts of Benedict XII., Innocent VI., and Urban V. were ineffectual to counteract the influence of these wide-spread disorders. Relaxation and dissoluteness infected every member of the Church, from the highest to the lowest; stem and branch languished, barren and dishonored.

B.—GREAT WESTERN SCHISM (A. D. 1378–1417 AND 1439–1449)—POPES AT ROME AND AT AVIGNON—REFORMATORY SYNODS OF PISA, CONSTANCE, AND BASLE.

I. Documents: In *Raynald.*, *Baluz.*, *Bulaei* Hist. Univ. Paris, T. IV.; *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 763 sq.; *Martène* et *Durand*, Thesaur. nov. anecdotor., T. II., p. 1073; *Eorundem*, Vett. Scriptor. Collectio ampliss., T. VII., p. 425 sq. *Theodoricus de Niem* (Abbreviator of the Roman Pontiffs, 1378–1410, † Archbishop of Cambrai, 1417), De schism. inter Papas et Antip. (to 1410), libb. III. continued under the title "Nemus unionis.," Bas. 1560 f.; Argentor. 1608 and 1629, 8vo.

II. Works: *Du Puys*, Hist. du schisme 1378–1428, Par. 1654 and oftener. *Maimbourg*, Hist. du grand schisme d'Occident, Par. 1678, 4to; German, 1792. Praefatio and *Martène* et *Durand*, Ampliss. coll., T. VII. *Christophe*, l. c., T. III. †**Schwab*, John *Gerson*, Professor of Theology and Chancellor of the University of Paris, Würzburg, 1858. **Hefele*, On the Origin of the Great Western Schism in the fourteenth century (Suppl. to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., p. 326 sq., and Hist. of Coun., Vol. VI., p. 628 sq.)

§ 269. *Urban VI.* (A. D. 1378–1389)—*Boniface IX.* (A. D. 1389–1404)—*Innocent VII.* (A. D. 1404–1406)—*Gregory XII.* (A. D. 1406–1409.)

The Romans, warned by the disastrous events of preceding pontificates, and apprehensive that another Pope in the interest of France might succeed to Gregory XI, earnestly insisted at the conclave, that in any event an Italian, and, if possible, a Roman, should be chosen to fill the papal throne. The cardinals, after having paid the last tribute of respect to the remains of the late Pope, immediately proceeded to the election of his successor. Bartholomew of

Prignano, the well-known and highly esteemed Archbishop of Bari, in Apulia, received the unanimous vote of the conclave. This prelate, who had already acquired name and distinction by the ability with which he managed the Roman chancery under Gregory XI., after the adjustment of a misunderstanding arising out of a confusion of his name with that of the Frenchman, Jean de Barre, ascended the throne of St. Peter, under the name of *Urban VI.* He was crowned in the presence of the College of Cardinals, of princes, lords, and people, and not a single voice was raised to question the legality of his election.

We are informed by Theodoric of Niem, a writer *whose testimony will not be questioned*, that Urban, assured of the love of his people, provoked the Cardinals to opposition by the harshness of his language, and needlessly offended many of the secular princes. Hence, the French Cardinals, giving as an excuse for their conduct their inability to endure the excessive heat of a Roman summer, withdrew to Anagni, and from this place opened communication with Urban. They sent him a petition, in which they required that he should give up the pontifical tiara and the other insignia of his office, and resign the papal dignity, advancing, as a reason for this strange demand, that his election in the Vatican, at Rome, had not been free. If such was really the case, then they contradict themselves; for in their report of the election, forwarded to the cardinals who had remained behind at Avignon, they had asserted quite the contrary. Their words were as follows: On the Feast of Pentecost "at very same hour when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, we, *acting undoubtedly under the guidance of the same Spirit*, by a free and unanimous vote, chose the Archbishop of Bari, a man of great virtue and merit."[1] Unfortunately, Urban, with characteristic obstinacy, rejected the advice of *St. Catharine of Siena*, who, solicitous for the welfare of the Church, had counseled him to fill the College of Cardinals with men who by their talents and virtue would be worthy of so great a dignity. The imprudent conduct of the Pope gave offense to many, and even those best disposed were gradually alienated from him.

---

[1] It does not appear that external influence and *freedom* of election were, under the circumstances, incompatible. Prima Vita Greg. XI., in *Baluzii* PP. Aven., T. I., p. 442, and Secunda Vita ejusd., ibid., p. 456; *Theodor. de Niem*, in the territory of Paderborn; De Schismate, lib. I., c. 2; *Gobelinus Persona*, Cosmodrom., act. VI., p. 298; *Raynald.* ad ann. 1378, no. 2 sq.) The freedom of election, the special object of attack, was ably vindicated by the first jurists of that age, such as *Joannes de Lignano* and *Jacobus de Sera*, doctors of Bologna, and *Baldus*, professor at Perugia. St. Catharine of Sweden, daughter of St. Bridget,

The three Italian Cardinals whom he sent to effect a reconciliation with the thirteen French Cardinals who had fled the city, were by the latter artfully persuaded to participate in the conclave at *Fondi*, whither those who had remained behind at Avignon, had already repaired.

A promise of election had been given to each of the Italian Cardinals as the reward of his treachery, and the three of them were not a little amazed when the election of Cardinal Robert, Count of Geneva, Cardinal-priest of the church of the Twelve Apostles, was announced. He took the name of *Clement VII.* (A. D. 1378–1394.) Clement, not feeling secure on Italian soil, retired to Avignon, and it was not long before French diplomacy had secured for him the obedience of Naples and Savoy, Castile, Aragon, and Navarre, and Scotland and Lorraine. The Catholic world, thus distracted, knew not to which of the two claimants to papal authority to yield obedience.

Urban, at length convinced of the necessity of the measure, resolved to create a new College of Cardinals for himself, which should include twenty-nine bishops selected from the churchmen of different nations. He also passed sentence of excommunication upon the French Cardinals and their adherents, and applied himself to the work of establishing order at Rome. Through the efforts of St. Catharine of Siena, who labored assiduously in his cause, many states and cities were induced to pass over to his obedience.

Clement VII., on the other hand, by his cruel system of extortion, punished France for her complicity in his election and the maintenance of his authority, while he himself, hav-

---

then residing at Rome, and an eye-witness of events, testified, according to the declaration of many of the cardinals, that the election was entirely free and lawful.

ing wittingly become the tool of French policy, was forced to put up with every sort of insult.[1]

Joanna, Queen of Naples, who espoused the cause of Clement VII., paid dearly for her devotion. The sufferings which she endured in consequence, and which culminated in her murder, A. D. 1382, are indeed appalling. Though four times married, she left no issue, and her death was the signal for the breaking out of violent quarrels regarding the succession to the throne, in which both Popes participated. Five Roman Cardinals, who, as was said, acting under the counsel of the canonist *Bartolino* of *Piacenza*, aimed at placing Pope Urban under constraint, were by order of the latter apprehended, cruelly tortured, and finally put to death at Genoa. Several other cardinals, warned by the fate of their colleagues, fled to Avignon. Urban had placed Naples under *interdict*, and was preparing to reduce that city to subjection, when he died at Rome, October 15, 1389.

His death did not close the schism. The Roman Cardinals at once proceeded to an election, and chose Peter Tomacelli, a Neapolitan, to succeed to Urban. The newly elected Pope, who took the name of *Boniface IX.*, carried on a systematic traffic in benefices and indulgences for the profit of his relatives. Each of the contending Popes anathematized the other, and, by a strange perversion of law and right, both were content to rest their claims on the recognition of civil governments, and either deemed himself specially fortunate if he secured the support of any of the great institutions of learning. The *University of Paris*, subsequently called the "*Sorbonne*,"[2] was most prominent in its efforts to put an end to the schism.[3] It proposed three courses, any of which might be taken as a basis of settlement[1]—viz., either the voluntary abdication of the two pontiffs; the submitting of the whole question to a tribunal of arbitrators; or, finally, the convocation of an ecumenical council. Clement VII. was so pained by the tenor of the energetic letter addressed to him by the University that he died of a malady brought on by grief and disappointment (September 6, A. D. 1394).

---

[1] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De corrupto ecclesiae statu, in *von der Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. I., P. III., p. 19.

[2] This name is taken from *Robert of Sorbon*, aulic chaplain of St. Louis, who established one of the sixty-three colleges of the university: "Collegium Sorbonicum ad commune hospitium pauperum scholarium et magistrorum in Theologia studentium." The name of Sorbonne was first applied to the theological faculty only, but at length the whole university received this designation.

[3] The first efforts against the oppression of the Church date from 1381. Cf. *Bulaei* Hist. Univ. Paris., T. IV., p. 582 sq. In the same year, however, appeared the work of *Henry of Langenstein* or *de Hassia* (vice-chancellor of the

He was succeeded by Peter de Luna, a crafty Spanish Cardinal, who took the name of *Benedict XIII.*, and whose election put fresh difficulties in the way of closing the schism. He had promised, while the election was going forward in the conclave, that, if the choice should fall upon himself, he would employ every means in his power to restore unity to the Church; and that, if it should be found necessary, he would willingly put aside his own claims to bring about so happy an event. But once upon the papal throne, these fair promises were either forgotten or disregarded. Benedict, by his ability and address, succeeded in bringing over to his side *Nicholas de Clémangis*, the ablest representative of the Sorbonne. He also persuaded the famous *Peter d'Ailly* (Petrus ab Alliaco) to accept a bishopric at his hands, and drew to his court *St. Vincent Ferrer*, the Thaumaturgus of that age.

In the meantime, Charles VI., King of France, had summoned the clergy to meet at Paris (A. D. 1395), for the pur-

---

University of Paris and professor of theology at Vienna from 1384). This work is entitled "Concilium pacis: de unione ac reformatione eccles. *in concilio universali* quaerenda." (*Gerson.* Opp. ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 809–840. *Von der Hardt*, Conc. Constant., T. II., P. I., p. 2–61. The author already holds that, in case of schism, a General Council may assemble *without being either convoked or presided over by the Pope.* It is especially in his answers to the objections (c. 12–15) that he strives to establish his arguments in favor of this thesis.

[1] The opinion given on the 6th of June, and found in *Bulaei* Hist. Univ. Paris., T. IV., p. 687 sq., and in *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 776. Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1389, nro. 14; ad an. 1390, nro. 8, proposed *three* ways of restoring peace to the Church—*namely:* 1. By "cessio;" 2. By "compromissio;" and, 3. By a "concilium generale aut secundum formam juris ex Praelatis tantummodo celebrandum, aut quia plures eorum satis, proh pudor! hodie illiterati sunt, pluresque ad alterutram partem inordinate affecti, *mixtis una cum Praelatis ad aequalem eorum numerum Magistris et Doctoribus theologiae ac juris* de studiis solemnibus utriusque partium antiquitus approbatis."

pose, if possible, of putting an end to the schism. This assembly proposed that the two rival Popes should voluntarily surrender their respective claims. This plan was not acceptable to Benedict, who made every shift to evade complying with it, and even succeeded in persuading the University of Toulouse to espouse his cause. The only effect of his conduct was to make the assembly still more resolute in its demands, and it now sternly insisted upon his abdication. The members of the assembly, fearing that Benedict might pass censures upon them which would either embarrass or render their work abortive, appealed "from him to the future, true, and orthodox Pope of the universal Church." *Gerson* at this juncture took upon him the office of mediator, and endeavored to stay the proceedings of the assembly by pointing out to it the dangerous precedent which their proposed line of action would set up; but, notwithstanding his protests, the assembled prelates and deputies of the universities favored a withdrawal of all obedience from Benedict till he should consent to abdicate. This measure had also its influence upon the obedience given to *Boniface;* for when King *Wenceslaus*, notwithstanding that he had been warned against so doing by the more prudent and far-seeing Rupert of the Palatinate, adopted the policy of the French King, requiring that both Popes should abdicate, Boniface, in his turn, taking advantage of the discontent which existed against Wenceslaus in Germany, sėt up Rupert as king (A. D. 1400), and thus the schism, which had existed only in the Church, was carried into the Empire also.[1] Owing to the political troubles and discords of kings and nations, the two obediences continued to exist longer than would otherwise have been the case.

Gerson again attempted—notably in his work entitled the "*Trialogus*"—to reconcile differences and unite the two obediences. "It is," he exclaims, "a sad day when passion usurps the place of truth, and heresy stalks abroad." He also spoke out his mind with noble independence, in an address which he delivered at Tarascon, on New Year's Day, A. D. 1404, in the presence of Benedict, in the course of which he said that abdication, inasmuch as it was, if not the only, the most speedy way of securing peace, became the plain duty of the parties concerned. Benedict, fearing that public opinion might set in against him and wishing to save appearances, opened communication with Boniface, but before anything came of this attempt, the latter died (October 1, A. D. 1404).

---

[1] **Hoefler*, Rupert of the Palatinate, called Clem, King of the Romans (1400–1410), Freiburg, 1861.

But the cardinals, who had been sent to Rome by the antipope to assist in bringing about peace, having stated that their master had no thought of abdicating, the Roman cardinals, after having singly pledged themselves by oath[1] that he upon whom the choice should fall, would do all in his power, and even abdicate if necessary, to close the existing schism, at once proceeded to an election. The choice was hastily made, because of the clamors of the seditious populace, and fell upon Cardinal Meliorato, who took the name of *Innocent VII.* Notwithstanding that he was a man of exemplary piety, he was everywhere represented by the antipope, who was then traveling about in Italy, as the cause of the continuance of the schism. Worn out by the rebellious spirit of the fickle Roman populace, and deceived by the treacherous assistance of Ladislaus, he withdrew to Viterbo. He afterward returned to his capital where he died November 5, A. D. 1406.

He was succeeded by Cardinal Angelo Corrario, who took the name of *Gregory XII.* Gregory had given the most solemn promises that, in the event of his election, he would make every sacrifice to bring about the peace of the Church, and that, if it should be thought expedient, he would even resign the papal dignity. Notwithstanding all this, the shuffling and double-dealing of the two pontiffs, relative to a proposed conference appointed to be held at *Savona*, for the settlement of difficulties, surpassed anything that had heretofore taken place, and forms one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of the Church. The proposals of the one were rejected by the other. The one preferred a town on the seaboard, the other an inland town. It almost seemed that they had entered into a secret compact to trifle with the agonized feelings of Christendom. It was sneeringly said "that

---

[1] *Theodor. de Niem*, De schism, lib. II., c. 34.

Gregory, being a landsman, could not bear the sight of water, and his opponent, being of an aquatic turn, had a wholesome dread of land." France now refused obedience to Benedict, and the Roman Cardinals fell from the side of Gregory. Thus disengaged, both parties, at a conference held at Leghorn, agreed to meet at *Pisa*, in March, A. D. 1409, and hold an *Ecumenical Council* for the purpose of putting an end to these disastrous dissensions.

It is evident from the letters of convocation, that its framers did not fully seize the question at issue, nor grasp the principle of its solution. It contained the germ which might, as *Gregory XII.* clearly pointed out in his protest, bear dangerous fruit in the future. He said "that judgment had been given though there had been no judge, and that the council had been convoked only to ratify the verdict which the cardinals had already rendered." He further maintained that since the right of convoking an ecumenical council was the exclusive prerogative of the Pope, and that since he was both willing and prepared to convoke and hold a council, provided only the choice of the place of holding it should be left to two persons selected by himself and the cardinals, he could not consent to recognize the Council of Pisa, without at the same time degrading the pontifical authority, and setting up a precedent which would be fraught with danger to future generations, and would imperil the safety of that See on whose stability depended the welfare of the Church. The attitude of hostility assumed by the Popes later on, in relation to their cardinals, tended to complicate affairs still further. *D'Ailly* and *Gerson* labored,[1] ineffectually however, to defend and justify the action of the Council of Pisa in assembling *without having been convoked and participated in by the Pope.*

Gerson took the novel ground, that in the case of a conflict between two rivals, each claiming and having apparently an equal right to the same dignity, the fairest and most efficient way of doing justice between them, would be to put both claimants aside and set up a third in their place. No harm, he said, would come to the *unity of the Church* from such a proceeding. This would be preserved by the bond existing between the visible Church and Christ, her Invisible Head. The Church, in such a hypothesis, having no visible Head, either because the Pope was politically or corporally dead, or because the faithful had refused to recognize him, might proceed to supply this trifling defect and give herself a new Head by means of a council convoked by the Cardinals. It is quite evident from what has been said, that very serious doubts were entertained as to the ecumenical character of the Council of Pisa, even prior to its opening.[1]

---

[1] *Petr. de Alliaco,* Aliquae propositiones utiles ad extinctionem schismatis praesentis per viam Conc. general. (*Gerson,* Opp., T. II., p. 112 sq., and *Martène,* Coll., T. VII., p. 905 sq.) *Gerson,* Tractatus de unitate ecclesiastica (Opp. ed. *du Pin,* T. II., p. 114 sq.; Commonitorium, T. II., p. 121 sq., and the address to the English embassy in Paris, ibid., p. 123–130. Cf. *Mansi,* T. XXVII., p. 172–186.) *Hefele,* Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 791 sq.

§ 270. *Council of Pisa* (*March* 25 *to August* 7, A. D. 1409)—*Alexander V.* (A. D. 1409–1410)—*John XXIII.* (A. D. 1410–1417.)

I. Varia Acta conc. Pisani et ad illud spectantia (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 803–862), in *Mansi*, T. XXVI., p. 1131 sq., and T. XXVII., p. 1–522. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1929–1962; T. VIII., p. 1–204. *Theodor. de Niem*, Tract. de schism. III. 38 sq.

II. *Lenfant*, Hist. du concile de Pise, Amst. 1724–27, II. T., 4to. †*Richerii* Hist. concilior general., lib. II., c. 2, T. II., p. 64–131. †*Von Wessenberg*, The Great Councils of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Constance, 1840, 4 vols.), T. II., p. 48–69. To rectify the partiality of this author, see *Hefele*, Critical Examination of Wessenberg, in the Tübingen Quarterly Review, 1841, nro. 4, and especially "*The Catholic*," 1840, November number. †*Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 229 sq. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 863 sq.

The opening of the Council of Pisa was a very imposing and brilliant affair. The Sacred College was represented by twenty-two cardinals of both obediences—the episcopate by four titulary patriarchs, ten archbishops, and sixty-nine bishops, who came in person, and by the procurators of one hundred and two archbishops and bishops; the priesthood by eighty-seven abbots, personally present, and by the proxies of two hundred others, by forty-one priors and the generals of four Mendicant Orders. There were also present the grand master and sixteen commanders of the Knights of St. John, the prior-general of the Holy Sepulcher, the procurator-general of the Teutonic Order, and the representatives of one hundred and nine cathedrals and collegiate chapters; the embassadors of princes and the deputies of thirteen universities;[1] one hundred and twenty-three doctors of theology, and nearly two hundred doctors and licentiates of canon and civil law; the ambassadors of almost every king, prince, and republic of the West. Science, the priesthood, and the State were therefore well represented.[2]

---

[1] The doubt gained strength when the main affair of the Council of Pisa, the election of Alexander V., was disavowed by the deposition of his successor, John XXIII. Hence the council was styled in *Antonini* Summa historialis, Tit. XXII., c. 5, § 3: "*Conciliabulum*, cum non esset auctoritate alicujus eorum, qui se gerebant pro Pontifice, congregatum et per idem non erat ablatum schisma, sed augmentatum." *Bellarminus*, De conciliis et ecclesia, lib. I., c. 8., calls it: "Nec approbatum, nec reprobatum." Also, *Ballerinus*, De Potest. eccl. summor. Pontif. et conc. general., c. 6, denies its ecumenical character. The Gallicans alone are of a contrary opinion, and consider the Council of Constance a sequel to that of Pisa.

The first session of the council was opened on the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, A. D. 1409, under the presidency of *Guido de Malesec*, the senior cardinal.

The council, after having listened to the arguments of its two most distinguished and learned representatives, *Peter d'Ailly*, who had been made Bishop of Cambrai in 1398, and *Peter d'Anchorano*, a jurisconsult of Bologna, together with some others, declared, in its eighth and ninth sessions, that it had been *canonically convoked* and *truly represented the whole Church.* In the twelfth session, it set aside the protest of the two Popes, and of Rupert, King of Germany, and Ladislaus, King of Naples, both of whom had espoused the cause of Gregory XII. and renounced all obligation of obedience to either of the rival pontiffs. The Patriarch of Alexandria publicly read the following decree: "Whereas the shameless misconduct and excesses of both claimants are notorious, and whereas scandal is imminent and delay may be dangerous, immediate action shall be taken against them." In the *fif-*

---

[1] *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 854 sq. (Tr.)

[2] It is hardly possible to give the exact number of the members, on account of different statements. *Mansi* probably presents the most complete enumeration, in his T. XXVI., pp. 1136, 1184, and T. XXVII., p. 331 sq. — *Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 5, 46.

teenth session (June 5, 1409), both were pronounced obstinate, declared to have perjured themselves, and were cut off from the Church as hopelessly heretical(?) and schismatical. It was further enacted that the See of Rome was vacant, and that the body of the faithful and emperors and kings were absolved from all allegiance to either of the claimants.

All doubts touching the validity of this sentence, if any such existed in the minds of the Fathers, were satisfactorily cleared up by the arguments of the French theologians present at the council, and by those contained in the work of *Gerson*, "On the Separation of the Pope from the Church."[1] Gerson argued, in the work just alluded to, that there were certain cases in which the Pope might be legally deposed; for, as he went on to prove, starting with the Aristotelian principle of government, the Church, like every other society in the enjoyment of its freedom, has a clear right to rid herself of a prince when once she is convinced that he has become hopelessly incorrigible. It would seem that this line of reasoning was perfectly satisfactory to the council.

In the sixteenth session, the cardinals entered into a solemn engagement, by which each bound himself that, in case the choice should fall upon him at the approaching election, he would not dissolve the council until it had provided for a thorough *reformation of the Church, in both Head and members.*[2]

The question now came up as to whether the right of electing a Pope appertained to the whole council or to the cardinals exclusively. After a lengthy discussion, the latter opinion was adopted. The cardinals of both obediences, now twenty-four in number, went into conclave on the 15th of June, and in the ninteenth session, on the 26th of the same month, elected Cardinal Peter Philargi of Candia, who took the name of *Alexander V.* He was a member of the Order of Friars Minor, had written a work of some merit on the Liber Sententiarum of Peter Lombard, and enjoyed a high reputation as a theologian and preacher. His moral character was above suspicion, and his habits austere. Wealthy as the Bishop of Milan, but poor as a cardinal, he was reduced to absolute want by his imprudent habits of extravagance after he had become Pope. That he had the best intentions, there can be no doubt, but it is also equally true that he was the serviceable tool of the shrewd and designing *Cossa, Cardinal Legate* of Bologna.

---

[1] Libellus de auferibilitate Papae ab ecclesia, according to Matt. ix. 15: Veniet dies cum auferetur ab eis sponsus (*Gerson*, Opp., T. II., p. 209–224); see *Schwab*, p. 250 sq.

[2] Conf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1409, nr. 71: "Cardinales sacramento se obstrinxere singuli, si ad Pontificalis dignitatis fastigium eveherentur, concilium propagaturos, donec de ecclesiastica disciplina restituenda leges conditae forent," etc. *Gerson* forcibly represented to Pope Alexander V., previously to his coronation, the necessity of this reform. Sermo factus coram Alex. P. in die Ascens. Domini. (*Gerson*, Opp., T. II., p. 131–141; *Mansi.*, T. XXVII., p. 413 sq.)

The notorious speech said to have been delivered at the Council of Pisa by Gerson (who was not present there at all), and addressed to Alexander V., was only an open letter to that Pope, by which the writer sought to secure him to the reform movement, and in this way furnish a basis of a reunion and an enduring peace between the Eastern and Western Churches.

The council held very few sessions after the election of Alexander; but during these, the Pope, taking into consideration the motions of the French, English, German, and Polish bishops, remitted the payment of all arrears due to the papal treasury, relinquished the revenues of the vacant bishoprics (fructus medii temporis), and ordered the holding of *provincial and diocesan synods* and *general chapters* of religious Orders.

The council finally broke up, in its twenty-third session, August 7th, *without* having done anything toward effecting that *reformation* of the Church, in her head and members, which had been so much spoken of and deemed of such vital importance. The Fathers did not, however, entirely give up the subject. Before separating, they *unanimously agreed* that they would again come together within the course of three years and take up the subject afresh.[1] The character of these zealous reformers seems to warrant the suspicion that there may have been *very substantial* reasons for this delay. Indeed, no one seemed to know precisely how to go about furnishing a remedy for the existing and deplorable evils. It was, moreover, of the greatest importance, before proceeding further, to have the newly elected Pope universally recognized. Unfortunately, Spain, Portugal, and Scotland remained loyal to Benedict, while Ladislaus of Naples, and several of the minor Italian States, were equally firm in their allegiance to Gregory. As the far-seeing Rupert, King of Germany, had predicted, Europe saw to her dismay and pain that she was now obliged to make choice between *three,* instead of two *claimants to the papal throne.* The evil effects which followed the council are chiefly to be attributed to kings and princes, who, instead of following the example of the Fathers of the Council of Pisa, and meeting the wishes of the Christian world, did more, by the selfish policy which they pursued, to inflame, than to allay the passions which the schism had called into play.

---

[1] The acts of the council say expressly, and the Pope repeats: "Decernimus, *sacro approbante Concilio, sacro requirente et approbante Concilio* — iterum generale Concilium eccl. fore convocandum hinc ad triennium," etc.

Alexander, fearing to take up his residence at Rome, withdrew to Bologna, where he died May 3, A. D. 1410.

Cardinal *Cossa,* notwithstanding that rumors were abroad of his having dealt foully with Alexander, was elected successor to the latter, and took the name of *John XXIII.*

Theodoric of Niem gives a frightful, but probably exaggerated account of the wickedness of his life, the depravity of his morals, and the violence of his conduct. The Florentine historian, *Bartolomei Valori,* and the monk of St. Denys represent him in a more favorable light.[1] He confirmed all the ordinances of his predecessor, and the acts of the Council of Pisa; announced his own election to churches and princes, and called upon all to aid him in getting rid of the antipopes. In matter of fact, John was recognized by the great majority of Catholic nations. He persuaded the Electors of the German Empire, to which, now that Rupert was dead, there were three claimants, as well as to the papacy, to give their votes to *Sigismund* of Luxemburg, and forced Ladislaus of Naples to renounce his allegiance to Gregory.

It was smooth sailing for John as long as he did not touch the pockets of his subjects, but no sooner had he exacted the tithes of all benefices, the revenues of vacant churches, and the property of deceased ecclesiastics, than the Sorbonne and the Parliament of France entered their protests against these and similar pretensions.

---

[1] Cf. *Hefele,* Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., p. 10 sq.

In April, A. D. 1412, the Pope, to preserve appearances, opened *at Rome* the council which had been agreed upon at Pisa for the reformation of the Church in her head and members.[1] Quite a small number of bishops put in an appearance, who, after having condemned the antipopes, and some heretical propositions of *Wicliffe* and *John Huss*, hastily adjourned. John, who does not seem to have had any very earnest wish to correct his own life, and who, consequently, could not be expected to be over solicitous about the correction of those of others, was carefully provident to prevent the bishops coming to Rome in excessive numbers. He had come to a secret understanding with Ladislaus, his former enemy, that the latter should have all the roads well guarded. Ladislaus, soon turned against the Pope, and forced him to quit Rome, and seek refuge, first, at Florence, and next at Bologna (A. D. 1413). From this city John opened communications with the princes of Europe with the purpose of fixing a place for holding the council. Ladislaus having suddenly died, his successor, the Emperor Sigismund, appointed the city of Constance, where the council did in fact convene November 1, A. D. 1414. Works were now published in anticipation of the Council, in which the necessity of speedily providing efficient means for the removal of existing evils was strongly urged upon the Fathers.[2]

§ 271. *The Council of Constance* (A. D. 1414–1418).

Herman v. d. Hardt, Magnum oecumen. concil. Constant., Frcf. et Lps. 1697–1700, 6 vols. f.; also in *Mansi*, TXXVII., XXVIII., and *Harduin*, T. VIII. *Theodorici Vrie* (Augustinian Friar of Osnabrück, eye-witness), De Consolatione Eccl., being an Historia concilii Constant. in *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. I. *Ulrich von Richenthal* of Constance, an eye-witness, wrote, Council of Constance,

---

[1] Cf. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 505–507. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 203.

[2] Among these must be reckoned Tractatus de modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam in Concilio Universali (A. D. 1410), ad *Petrum de Alliaco*, Cardinal. Cameracens. (Opp., ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 161 sq.; *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. V., p. 67 sq.), ever since the times of *von der Hardt* attributed to Gerson; so likewise the treatises de difficultate reformationis eccles. and de necessitate reformat eccles. (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. V., p. 255–269; T. I., P. VII., p. 277–398; and

---

Augsburg, 1483, 1536, in fol. and oftener. *John Stumpff* (author of the Swiss Chronicle), Short account of the great General Council of Constance, Zürich, 1550, 4to. *Marmor*, Hist. of the Council of Constance, according to Ulrich of Richenthal, Constance, 1860. *Döllinger*, Materials for a history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 1863, Vol. II. *Bourgeois du Chastenet*, Nouvelle Hist. du concile de Constance, Par. 1718, 4to (mostly documents). *Theod. de Niem*, Invectiva in diffugientem a Const. Conc. Joan. XXIII., in *v. d. Hardt*, T. II., P. XIV. and XV., p. 296–830. *Ejusdem* Vita Joan. XXIII., ibid., p. 336–460. *Lenfant*, Hist. du concile de Constance, ed. II., Amsterd. 1727, 2 vols. 4to. †*Tosti*, Storia del Concilio di Costanza, Napoli, 1853, 2 T., 4to, Germ. by *Arnold*, Schaffhausen, 1860. *Natal. Alex.* h. e. saec. XV., diss. III.–VII. †*Emmanuel Schelstrate*, Compend. chronol. rer. ad decreta Const. spect., at the head of his treatise, De sensu et auctoritate decretor. Const. conc., Rom. 1686, 4to. †*Richerii* Hist. Concilior. gener., lib. II., c. 3, T. II., p. 131–270. †*Royko*, Hist. of the Synod of Constance, Vienna and Prague, 1782 sq., 4 vols. (a prolix, narrow-minded, and very partial work.) †*Wessenberg*, The Great Councils, Vol. II., p. 69–267. Cf. *Hefele*, l. c., and *The Catholic*, 1841, *Jan.*, *Febr.*, July, Aug., and Sept. numbers. **Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 497–527. †*Aschbach*, Life of Emperor Sigismund, Frankfort (1838–45, 4 vols.), Vol. II., p. 69 sq. *Hübler*, The Constance Reformation, Lps. 1867. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., Pt. I.

The abuses which prevailed generally throughout the Church, and which were considerably increased by the existence of *three* rival Popes, and by the various theories on Church government called forth by the controversy, greatly perplexed men's minds, and created much anxiety as to the direction affairs might eventually take. This unsettled state of feeling accounts for the unusually large number of ecclesiastics who attended the Council. There were eighteen thousand ecclesiastics of all ranks, of whom, when the number was largest, three were patriarchs, twenty-four cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, close upon one hundred and fifty bishops, one hundred and twenty-four abbots, fifty provosts, and three hundred doctors in the various degrees. Many princes attended in person. There were constantly one hundred thousand strangers in the city, and, on one occasion, as many as one hundred and fifty thousand, among whom were many of a disreputable character. Feeling ran so high that,

---

Gerson, Opp., T. II., p. 867 sq. and p. 885–902), which used to be fathered upon *Peter d'Ailly*. These works, after the profound investigations of *Schwab* (John Gerson, p. 470–492), draw their origin not from the men just mentioned, but from *Andrew of Randuf*, professor and Benedictine abbot, and *Theodoric de Niem*.

as might have been anticipated, every measure was extreme.

Owing to the peculiar composition of the Council, at which only a limited number of bishops were present, and these chiefly in the interest of John XXIII., it was determined to decide all questions, not by a majority of episcopal suffrages, but by that of the representatives of the various nations, including doctors. The work about to engage the Council was of a threefold character—viz: 1. *To terminate the papal schism;* 2. *To condemn errors against faith, and particularly those of Huss;* and 3. *To enact reformatory decrees* (*intendimus insistere pacem, exaltationem et reformationem ecclesiae et tranquillitatem populi Christiani*).

It was with some difficulty that *John* could be induced to attend at Constance, and when he did finally consent, it was only because he was forced to take the step by the representations of others. On his way through Switzerland his habit of swearing by the devil gave great offense to the simple-minded people of that country. When in sight of Constance, he remarked to his attendants: "Yonder is the trap in which foxes are taken." The day set for the opening of the Council was November 1st, and John arrived the 27th of October previous. Regarding the Council as a continuation of that of Pisa, he naturally thought that he would be recognized as the legitimate successor of the Pope chosen by the latter.

The Council opened November 5th, with all the splendor and magnificence John was so fond of displaying on great solemnities. At the *first general Session* held in the cathedral John delivered an address, exhorting the members to give their best energies and most mature consideration to whatever measures might serve to secure the peace of the Church. The officers of the different nations—viz., *Italian*, *French*, *German*, and *English* (the Spanish representatives of "Pope Benedict XIII." did not arrive till later)—were next appointed.

The Emperor Sigismund, who arrived at Constance on Christmas Eve, was received by the Pope in the cathedral, which was brilliantly illuminated for the occasion, after which vested, according to ancient custom, in deacon's dalmatic, he read the Gospel at the High Mass celebrated by the Pope.

At the general congregations, held in January, 1415, the admissibility of the representatives to be sent by Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. was discussed; and two memorials read, one from the Germans, and the other from the French Cardinal *Filastre*, of the title of St. Mark, demanding that a *judicial* and *definitive voice* (*vox judicativa et definitiva*) should not be confined to bishops and mitered abbots, but should be extended to the proxies of bishops, to abbots, chapters, and universities, and to masters, doctors, and the embassadors of princes; for, it was urged, doctors enjoyed a definitive voice at the Councils of Pisa (1409) and Rome (1412). As a means of restoring union, Filastre proposed that the *three claimants should simultaneously abdicate*, and a new pope be elected, and that this election should be decisive and recognized by all.

To both these propositions John XXIII. and his adherents offered a most vigorous resistance; and d'Ailly, in consequence, wrote a treatise, the drift of which was to show that the older councils had been of various composition, and that it was entirely wrong to allow a titular bishop, without a soul under his charge, to enjoy equal rights and influence with, say, the Archbishop of Mentz. He therefore demanded that particularly doctors of divinity and laws, out of consideration for their offices of teachers, and preachers, should be permitted a definitive voice. This treatise was supplemented by another, and more aggressive one, from the pen of Filastre, and through their efforts the measure was finally carried. It was moreover determined, on February 7th, that the vote should be taken, not by numerical representation, but *by nations*, each being entitled to only one ballot.

All questions were first discussed by the various nations, each member of which had the right to vote. Their decision was next brought before a general conference of nations, and this result again before the next session of the Council. This plan of organization destroyed the hopes of John XXIII., who relied for success on the preponderance of Italian prelates and doctors, who constituted, numerically, about one-half the qualified voters.

After the division of the Council into the above-named four nations, the Poles being included among the Germans, deputies both clerical and lay were nominated, and proctors and notaries appointed. Each nation was presided over by a president, who was changed every month.

To intimidate John, and subdue his resistance, a memorial, written probably by an Italian, was put in circulation, containing charges the most damaging to that pontiff's private character, and asserting that where guilt was so notorious, any investigation into the truth and accuracy of the charges was wholly unnecessary. And so timely and effective was this blow, that John was thenceforth utterly destitute of the energy and consideration necessary to support his authority, or direct the affairs of the Council. He, in consequence, commissioned the highly esteemed Cardinal Zabarella to declare in the general congregation, held February 16th, that in order to give peace to the Church, he would abdicate, provided Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. would also resign. But the proposal was hedged about with other clauses which might be so interpreted as to leave his abdication entirely to his own pleasure. Owing to the still more hostile attitude of the Council toward him after the arrival of the deputies of the University of Paris, headed by Gerson, February 18th, John, in the *second general session*, held March 2d, formally promised under oath, that in case the other two claimants would resign their pretensions, he would do the same. After this arrangement had been agreed to by the Council, the Emperor, the Cardinals, and the whole body broke out in expressions of thanksgiving. The Emperor was about to set out to Nizza, to induce the other claimants to resign, when John took exception to his course, and particularly objected to the plenipotentiaries appointed by the Council to represent himself. The suspicion at once gained ground, that John, with the assistance of *Frederic*, Duke of Austria and Count of Tyrol, intended to make good his escape from the Council. The latter disclaimed being an accomplice to this project, and John promised under oath "not to depart from the city before the Council had dissolved." But notwithstanding these protestations, John escaped (March 21, 1415), disguised as a groom, during a great tournament arranged by the Duke, and made his way to Schaffhausen, belonging to the latter, thence to Laufenburg and Freiburg, thence again to the fortress of Brisac, whence he had intended to pass to Burgundy, and on to Avignon.

That the Council went on with its work after the departure of John, and amid the general perplexity and confusion, was entirely due to the resolution of the Emperor, the eloquence of *Gerson*, and the indefatigable efforts of the venerable master, now Cardinal, *d'Ailly*.

The following memorable decrees were passed from the third to the fifth general sessions: "*A Pope can neither transfer nor dissolve a general Council without the consent of the latter, and hence the present Council may validly continue its work even after the flight of the Pope. All persons, without distinction of rank, even the Pope himself, are bound by its decisions, in so far as these relate to matters of faith, to the closing of the present schism, and to the reformation of the Church of God in her Head and members.*[1] *All Christians, not excepting the Pope, are under obligation to obey the Council.*"

Even before the close of the council, Cardinal d'Ailly and Gerson published writings in which they defended its action.[2] The propositions are, *from the very nature of the case*, both inadmissible and incapable of defense; for, in a body full of life and vigor, *each member* contributes to the general welfare, and if the Church is such, the principles contained in these articles are not applicable to her, nor could her true children have framed them. In matter of fact, the head is neither above nor subordinate to the body. It is *of* the body, and constitutes, *with* it, but *one* organization. No body can exist without its head, and no head without its body. They are inseparable. The conditions to the existence of a body in the natural order are verified in the case of the Church also, she being a mystical body, of which Christ is the invisible and the Pope the visible Head. The assertion, therefore, contained in the propositions that an ecumenical council is completely independent of the Head of the Church, is destructive of the very fundamental idea of the latter. All Catholics believe, with unquestioning faith, that the Head of the Church possesses the fullness of ecclesiastical authority, and that in order to have an ecumenical council, in the orthodox sense of these words, it is necessary that the Pope shall convoke such council, and essential that he shall preside, either personally or by his legates, and give his approbation to its decrees. Hence the Pope is in some sort *above* an ecumenical council.

---

[1] The original text of these decrees, as given in the oldest manuscripts, runs as follows: "Haec Sta Synodus in Spiritu scto congregata legitime, generale concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem repraesentans; potestatem a Christo immediate habet; cui quilibet cujuscunque dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quae pertinent *ad fidem* et extirpationem dicti schismatis et reformationem generalem ecclesiae in capite et membris." *Friedrich*, of the Munich Academy of Sciences, Historical Department, in the report of February 4, 1871, proves incorrect the statements of the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, Rome, 1867–68, and of *Deschamps*, Archbishop of Malines. Infallibility of the Pope and a General Council (Germ.), Mentz, 1869, p. 108 sq. Friedrich also proves that *John Turrecremata*, the Pope's theologian at Basle, in his two controversial works—"*Tractatus notabilis de potestate Papae et concilii generalis*" and "*De pontificis max. conciliique generalis auctoritate*"—quotes and draws out the bearing of the words *ad fidem*, which are wanting in the Hainault edition of the Conc. Const., ann. 1500, and in the reprints of Milan, 1511, and of Paris and Cologne. He also shows that the reading *ad finem* et extirpationem, found in the codex of Cardinal de Bouillon, was unknown to Turrecremata.

[2] *Petrus de Alliaco*, Tractatus de potestate ecclesiastica, in the year 1416 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. VI., p. 15–78; *Gerson*, Opp., T. II.) *Joh. Gerson*, Tract. de potest. eccl., A. D. 1417 (ibid., p. 78–137; Gerson, Opp., T. II., p. 225–260).

But, on the other hand, the circumstances which led to the convening of the Council of Constance were so unprecedented and abnormal that they seemed, for the time being, to give color to the assumption of independence. The three Popes (it being *uncertain which was the true one*) had really cut themselves off from communion with the Church; had rent asunder her unity, and refused to listen to moderate and just demands. Each of them was equally unwilling to yield any of his claims, to abdicate, or even to submit the question to arbitration.

It seems that the only way out of a difficulty so vast and threatening was to declare and maintain that the Pope was subject to an ecumenical council, and that when guilty of any offense against faith, or of any attempt to prevent the closing of schism, or the general reformation of morals, he might be lawfully deposed by it.

At a still later date, many of the Fathers of Constance asserted that the Pope was above an ecumenical council, and defended the doctrine with ability. And if Gerson afterward assailed the same doctrine in his public writings, he also conceded that the question did not as yet admit of a definitive solution, and confessed "that nothing but the confused state of opinion consequent upon a season of protracted schism could have brought the council to set aside the doctrine of papal supremacy, which had heretofore been universally accepted."[1]

The great mistake of the theologians of Constance consisted in giving to a line of action, to which they were driven by an abnormal condition of affairs, the force and authority of a *dogmatic principle.*[2] That they had not unlimited faith in the theory they advocated is evident from their own admissions. In the discussion concerning the formula drawn up for the *condemnation* of the works of Wicliffe and Huss, the question arose as to whether it should rest on the authority of the Pope, on that of the council, or of both; and of the forty doctors of theology having the matter in hand, and consisting of members of the various universities, twenty-eight refused to accede to the proposition of *d'Ailly*, "to have the condemnation pronounced in the name of the council, without mentioning the Pope;" "because," they said, "the council, of itself, possessed no authority except what it derived from its head (*ex capite*)." Again, *John*, Patriarch of Antioch, one of the Pope's most determined opponents, defended the two following propositions against d'Ailly: 1. The Pope is *not* subordinate to an ecumenical council; 2. The decrees of the present synod must be executed in the name of the Pope.[3]

Pope John, after getting away safe to Schaffhausen, complained formally of the action of the council toward himself, summoned all the cardinals to appear personally before him within six days, and sent memorials to the King of France, to the Dukes of Orleans, Berry, and Burgundy, and to the University of Paris, justifying his flight. Still the council went on with its work; disposed, after a fashion, of the papal difficulty, and of the cases of Huss and Jerome of Prague. For complicity in the escape of John XXIII., Frederic of Austria was placed by the Emperor Sigismund under ban of the empire and deprived of his estates. In the meantime, Frederic, Margrave of Brandenburg, acting under the joint order of council and emperor, arrested the fugitive Pope at Freiburg, and led him a prisoner to Radolfzell, near Constance, where fifty-four (originally seventy-two) charges—some of them of a most disgraceful character—extracted from the testimony of a host of witnesses, were laid before him by a committee of the council, May 27th. John, seeing that it was useless to attempt to shirk difficulties, resolved to face them and make the best possible terms with his judges. He replied to the committee that, previously to his elevation to the papacy, he had strenuously labored to restore union to the Church; had on one occasion, at Constance, offered to resign; was sincerely sorry for whatever faults he might have committed; would not attempt to exculpate himself, but, on the contrary, would submit the charges against him to the judgment of the council, whose decisions he would abide; *believed that the Council of Constance was holy and could not err*, and would take exception neither to its rulings nor to the depositions of the witnesses against himself. In the *twelfth session*, held May 29th, John XXIII. was formally and solemnly deposed; and it was further enacted that neither he, Gregory XII., nor Benedict XIII. could be ever again eligible to the papacy. Two days later, John, now called simply Balthasar Cossa, was confined in the castle of Gottlieben, belonging to the Bishop of Constance, where Huss had been lately imprisoned; was thence transferred to the castle of Heidelberg, and finally to Mannheim.

---

[1] De potestate eccles. consid. x. et xii.

[2] The words of Cardinal *Seripandi*, addressed to the Gallican *Ferrier* at Trent, are apposite, and make the distinction clear: "Allatum ab illo fundamentum Synodi Constant. haud solidum esse: id temporis *certum Romanum Pontificem non extitisse*, atque hinc ad schisma sedandum opus fuisse, ut declaratio ad synodum pertineret, adeoque ut illa praeesset cunctis illis pontificibus litigiosis. At in praesentia vivere inter Catholicos supremum pontificem: certum, legitimum atque indubitatum, cui universa ecclesia subdebatur" (*Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. XIX., cap. 14, nro. 5). Cf. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. I., p. 245-264.

[3] Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., pp. 111, 112.

Gregory XII. also consented now to redeem his promise, and accordingly resigned his claims, but not until he had issued a bull convoking the council and recognizing its authority. Believing himself to be the only *canonically elected Pope*, he felt that this measure was necessary to legalize his abdication, which took place July 19, A. D. 1415. As a reward for the sacrifice made by him to promote the peace of the Church, and for the conciliatory disposition he exhibited, he was raised to the dignity of Cardinal Legate of Ancona. He died in October, 1417.

The Emperor Sigismund went in person to Perpignan, to confer with *Benedict XIII.*, whom he endeavored to persuade to renounce his claims to the papacy, but the old man obstinately refused to consent. Even the Spaniards now withdrew from his obedience, and of all who had once recognized him, only the inhabitants of the little town of Peñiscola, in Valencia, remained loyal to him. On the return of the Emperor to Constance, the process against Benedict was commenced, and terminated with his deposition in the thirty-seventh session, held July 26, 1417. In the act of deposition he was described as a perjurer, a schismatic, and a heretic; as one who by his conduct had done all in his power to subvert the unity of faith, and the catholicity of the Church.

The Catholic world took no further notice of him, but he continued to persistently assert his claims, and to declare to the world that the Church had, for the present, sought refuge in the quiet town of Peñiscola, which he compared to the Ark of Noah, and whence, like Noah of old, she would again come forth after the storm had gone by. He died in 1424.

The three claimants to the papacy having been thus disposed of, it now remained to elect a legitimate successor to St. Peter. Previously to proceeding to an election, a decree was passed providing that *in this particular instance, but in no other*, six deputies of each nation should be associated with the Cardinals in making the choice.

The conclave consisted of twenty-three cardinals, and thirty deputies, for whom fifty-three cells were prepared at the private residence of a merchant of Constance. On the 11th of November, 1417, the unanimous suffrages of the conclave were given in favor of *Otho Colonna*, a cardinal distinguished for his great learning, his purity of life, and gentleness of disposition. He was ordained deacon November 12th; raised to the priesthood the following day; on the next, which was Sunday, consecrated bishop, and finally, on Sunday, November 21st, anointed and crowned under the name of *Martin V.* The Church had once more a recognized Head, order succeeded to confusion, and peace was once more restored to her children.

But it was necessary to make long and persevering efforts to secure these blessings. Sigismund and the German nation, and for a time the English also, insisted that the question of the reformation of the Church, the chief points of which had been sketched in a schema of eighteen articles,[1] should be taken up and disposed of *before* proceeding to the election of a Pope. After some discussion it became evident that the call upon the Council to elect a Pope was paramount to all others—an opinion which was advocated by the more prudent among its members, such as *Peter d'Ailly*, *Gerson*, and Cardinal *Zabarella*, who, in defense of their position, appealed to the words of our Lord: "Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand."[2] They also argued, that all experience had taught that any attempt to reform the Church in her Head and members by framing and passing decrees, which might be easily set aside by those for whose correction they were intended, under the plausible pretext that they had been enacted by an assembly destitute of its legitimate Head, would be utterly hopeless.[3] The work which the Council had proposed to accomplish, as already stated, was threefold. As yet only the first part of this triple task—namely, the closing of the schism—had been accomplished.

---

[1] In *von der Hardt*, T. IV., p. 1452, and in *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 1164.

[2] Matt. xii. 25.

[3] The protest entered by the cardinals and the three other nations against the Germans, on account of their long delay in electing a Pope, is very remarkable. It is dated September, 1417, and the following passage is there read: "*Praeterea si reformatio fienda est de deformatis, quae major est et esse potest in corpore deformitas, quam carere capite et acephalum esse?* Illa igitur prior tanquam magis necessaria debet esse reformatio, quae corpus ipsum ad caput reformet et *informet*, et contrarium asserere vel facere, non videtur esse securum." Sess. XXXVIII., in *Mansi.*, T. XXVII., p. 1152. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 849. The German nation had, moreover, from the very outset, openly declared that: "Nec est aut erit assertrix, nec umquam intravit ejus mentem hujusmodi *haereseos* infectio, ut ecclesiam sine summo Pontifice debite hierarchizari putet, aut utilem esse vacationem diutius protelatam." *Mansi.*, l. c., p. 1155. *Harduin*, p. 852.

An attempt had indeed been made by the Fathers to *crush out the heresy of John Huss*, of whom we shall presently have occasion to speak at length, but the attempt, instead of bettering matters, made them worse, and from the date of the heresiarch's arrival at Constance, November 3, A. D. 1414, to the date of his death, July 6th of the following year, he grew daily more obstinately attached to his errors. Even his death became a source of fresh troubles to the Church. Martin, the newly elected Pope, did not fully carry out all the proposed *reforms*. It is true, he appointed a committee composed of *six* cardinals and deputies from each nation, and gave the work into their hands; but their counsels were so conflicting that they could neither come to a definite agreement among themselves, nor would they consent to adopt the plan of reform submitted by the Pope.[1] The representatives of the several nations, conscious that the temper of the committee was not such as would admit of any arrangement at once satisfactory to each, and adequate to the wants of all, concluded that, under the circumstances, the most efficient way to remedy the terrible evils and correct the flagrant abuses which afflicted the Church, would be for each nation to enter into a separate *concordat* with the Pope.[2] These concordats interpreted and carried out in the spirit of the reformatory decrees, given below in a foot-note, would go far to remove abuses in both Church government and ecclesiastical life.

---

[1] This statute was published as early as the end of January, 1418, under the heading, "*Martini V.* reformatio in capite et curia Romana nationibus oblata." (*V. d. Hardt*, T. I., p. 1021–1045.)

[2] These concordats, concluded with the Germans, were dated May 2, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., p. 1055–1068). *Münch*, Complete collection of all the old and new Concordats, Pt. I., p. 20 sq.; cf. *Hübler*, l. c.: "C. I. de numero et qualitate Cardinalium et eorum creatione quod numerum XXIV. non excedant, nisi pro honore nationum, quae Cardinales non habent, unus vel duo pro semel de consilio et consensu Cardinalium assumendi viderentur; C. II. de provisione ecclesiar., monasterior., prioratuum, dignitatum et alior. beneficiorum; C. III. de annatis; C. IV. de causis tractandis in Romana curia nec ne; C. V. de commendis; C. VI. de simonia; C. VII. de non vitandis excommunitatis, antequam per judicem fuerint declarati et denuntiati; C. VIII. de dispensationibus; C. IX. de provisione Papae et Cardinalium; C. X. de indulgentiis: cavebit Dominus noster Papa *in futurum* nimiam indulgentiarum effusionem, ne vilescant, et *in praeteritum* concessas ab obitu Gregorii XI. ad instar alterius indulgentiae revocat et annullat." Caution and discretion are specially recommended to pastors: "Quia indulgentiarum materia gravis est, in ea caute ac discrete

As a high standard of education and an unexceptional morality among the clergy are essential conditions to the carrying out of any systematic and thoroughgoing ecclesiastical reform, it was quite impossible under the existing circumstances to achieve more than partial success in such an undertaking. Even the bishops seemed more intent upon advancing the temporal prosperity of their states, than upon securing the spiritual welfare of the faithful of their dioceses. Notwithstanding the earnest and repeated protests of the Council it was found impossible to at once overthrow the vast fabric of adventitious papal supremacy in political affairs, acquired gradually in the course of centuries; to confine papal authority within its primitive and constitutional limits; or to bring the Pope to lay aside the gorgeous sacerdotal vestments, which had taken the place of those of more early and simple ages, so long as German bishops appeared clad in ermine, wearing crowns upon their heads, and bearing swords at their sides.

Martin V. wisely proposed to bring the papal authority gradually within legitimate bounds, by commencing with the most flagrant abuses. He himself set the example by carrying into effect the general reforms contained in the *seven general* papal *decrees on reform*, which had been promulgated in the forty-third session of the Council. By these decrees *all exemptions of late introduction were declared void; the revenues of vacant sees, formerly paid to the Pope, were given up; the practice of simony in ordinations, in elections, and in the conferring*

---

versentur (parochi), nec quidquam, quod fidei nostrae minus conveniens aut populo sit scandalosum, proferant!" C. XI. de horum concordatorum valore (in *Walter*, Fontes juris ecclesiast. antiqui et hodierni, p. 86–96); with the English, July 12, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., p. 1079–1082): C. I. de numero et ratione Cardinal.; C. II. de indulgentiis; C. III. de appropriationibus, unionib., incorporationib. ecclesiar. et vicariatuum; C. IV. de ornatu Pontificali inferioribus Praelatis non concedendo; C. V. de dispensationibus; C. VI. de Anglis ad officia Rom. curiae assumendis; with the French, May 2, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., p. 1566–1579), on the same subjects, and besides, Praerogativa in obtinendis beneficiis Universitati Paris. concessa per Dom. Martinum Papam V.

of benefices prohibited; all persons before coming into possession of a benefice were required to take orders; churches and ecclesiastics were exempted from the obligation of paying tithes to the Pope; and all clerics were instructed and commanded to dress as became their calling and condition.

In the forty-fourth session of the Council, it was agreed that an ecumenical council should be held at Pavia, some time within the coming five years, and the announcement carried with it renewed hope of better things. In the thirty-ninth session a decree was passed directing that, in future, general councils should be held every ten years. The real intent of this decree was to make general councils an ordinary means of church government—a beautiful but wholly impracticable idea.

It had now become quite common to assert that the Pope was subject to an ecumenical council, and that appeals might be carried from him up to such tribunal for a new hearing. Martin, conscious that this opinion, if allowed to pass without censure, would work mischief, took the first favorable occasion to condemn it. A delegation of Poles represented to the Pope that *John von Falkenberg*, a native of Prussia, and member of the Order of St. Dominic, had written a work in the interest of the Teutonic Knights, in which some severe and offensive reflections were made upon the king and nobles of Poland, and requested that he would have it publicly condemned. The Pope, however, showed no inclination to comply with their request, and they appealed from him to the next ecumenical council. Martin then issued a bull, dated March 10th, in which he declared "*that it was unlawful for any one either to appeal from the judgments of the Apostolic See, or to reject its decisions in matters of faith.*"[1]

---

[1] Cf. *von der Hardt*, T. IV., p. 1548–1564; *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 899; *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 1200 sq. *Gerson* protested against this bull (Tractat. quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a summo Pontifice appellare seu ejus judicium declinare, Opp., T. II., p. 303–308), and attempted to show that Martin's own authority was derived from the supreme authority of the council which had deposed Cossa. Still, he did not wish to extend the privilege of appeal from the Pope to *all* cases, but only to certain exceptional ones; because, if a limit were not placed somewhere, obedience to the Church would be but a barren formality. Even the Protestant *Mosheim* shows that to carry out such a principle in prac-

In the forty-fifth and last session of the Council, held April 22, A. D, 1418, Martin confirmed those decrees relating to *matters of faith*, in the enactment of which the requirements of conciliar *usage* had been observed (quae *in materia Fidei conciliariter* determinata, conclusa, et decreta fuissent), and excluded from this confirmation all decrees to which such a test did not apply.[1] This is evident from the acts of the Council, and from the declaration of Martin's successor, *Eugene IV.* (1446), who, in approving the acts of the Council of Constance, specially excepted whatever might be detrimental to the rights, dignity, and supremacy of the Holy See (*absque tamen praejudicio juris, dignitatis et praeeminentiae Sedis Apostolicae*), which unquestionably includes the claims of superiority of ecumenical councils over Popes.[2] We can not subscribe to the statement of *Huebler*, that Martin's words imply that he approved whatever had been decided *in matters of faith* after the prescriptive conciliar form, as opposed to the form of nations (*conciliariter*, not *nationaliter* only), because the nations did not frame a decree concerning the Falkenberg pamphlet, which was nevertheless finally condemned by the Pope.

The Council was formally closed May 16, A. D. 1418. Martin V. returned to Italy, but as Rome was in possession of the Neapolitans, Bologna an independent republic, and the remainder of his States in the hands of petty tyrants, he was obliged to remain for the present at Florence. Before his de-

---

tice would be to destroy the idea of Catholic unity (De Gallorum appellationibus ad concilium universae ecclesiae unitatem ecclesiae spectabilis tollentibus, Dissertat. ad H. E., T. I., p. 577 sq.)

[1] i. e., tumultuariter, or in particular congregations, or on subjects relating to ecclesiastical discipline, or per modum constitutionum synodalium.

[2] For want of the Pope's approbation, says the author, to some of the decrees, we have not, in former editions of this work, given the Council of Constance a place among the ecumenical councils of the Church. But, since the second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381) and the fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) labor under a like defect, and since, in recent times, those best qualified to give an opinion have, in consequence of the vital and wide-reaching consquences resulting from the decrees of Constance, pronounced daily more and positively in favor of its ecumenicity, we have also concluded to give it as the Sixteenth Ecumenical Council of the Church, subject, however, to the clausal qualifications of Popes *Martin V.* and *Eugene IV.*

parture from Constance he had received a pressing invitation from the French, to again fix the Apostolic See at Avignon, and one equally pressing from Sigismund, who offered him his choice of the three cities of Basle, Strasburg, and Mentz, for the same purpose, both of which invitations he prudently declined. Balthasar Cossa (John XXIII.), who had been detained in prison since his deposition, now cast himself at the feet of Martin and implored forgiveness, and was by the latter created Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati. He died in the same year, A. D. 1419, at Florence, and was entombed in the celebrated baptistry of *San Giovanni*, opposite the cathedral.

Martin V. did not obtain possession of his capital till the year 1420, and then only by aid of the Florentines.

A difficulty that arose between Martin and the King of Aragon, again brought Peter de Luna into temporary prominence. He was succeeded by Muños, who styled himself Clement VIII., and in whom the line became extinct, after having done no further harm than to disturb for a time, the quiet of the inconsiderable town of *Peñiscola.*

Martin V., faithful to the promise he had given to the Fathers of Constance, convoked an ecumenical *council*, which convened at *Pavia*, A. D. 1423, but a contagious disease, which shortly after broke out in that city, made it necessary to transfer the assembly to *Siena.*[1] But few bishops were present, and they did little more than renew the *condemnation of the errors of Wicliffe and John Huss*, and propose a plan of reuniting the Greek and Latin Churches.

As the bishops, owing to the fewness of their number, the proximity of the theater of war, and the importance of the subjects to come under discussion, were unwilling to go on with the Council, the Pope declared it dissolved. And so the work of reform was again put off until the next ecumenical council which, owing to the threatening attitude of the Hussites, was, immediately before the death of Martin V. (February 20, A. D. 1431), convoked to assemble at *Basle.* As the measures adopted by the Fathers of Constance, instead of satisfying the wishes of those who were thoroughly in earnest in their desire to have a complete reformation of the Church, served rather to make them more anxious to see the work pushed *vigorously* forward, the successor to Martin was obliged to enter upon the difficult and long deferred task, with all the troublesome issues which it involved.

---

[1] Conc. Senense, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1013–1028. *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1057–1084.

§ 272. *Eugene IV.* (A. D. 1431–1447)—*Nicholas V.* (A. D. 1447–1455)—*The Council of Basle; its protest against being transferred to Ferrara and Florence—Emperor Sigismund—Albert II.* (A. D. 1438–1439)—*Frederic III.* (A. D. 1440–1493.)

For acts, see **Mansi*, T. XXIX.–XXXI.; *Harduin*, T. VIII., IX.; and *Würdtwein*, Subsidia diplom. Heidelb. 1774 sq., T. VIII.–IX. *Ang. Mai*, Spicilegium rom., Rom. 1829, T. I., p. 1–61 (in Eugene IV. and Nichol. V.) *Aeneas Sylvius*, Comment. de reb. Basileae gestis, etc. (1438–40), libb. III., Bas. 1577, ed. *Mich. Catalonus*, Firmi, 1803, 4to. At the head of these writings, more or less partial, must be placed *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum ac fugiendarum* (a weak elaboration which does not originate from *Orthuinus Gratius*), Colon. 1535; Lond. 1690.[1] *Augustinus Patricius* (canon of Siena), Summa concilior. Bas., Florent., etc. (*Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1081 sq.; *Hartzheim*, Conc. Germ. T. V., p. 474.) *Ambrosii Traversari* Epp. ed. Laur. Mehus., Florent. 1759 f. The Scriptores Concilii Basil., in Monumenta Concilior., saec. XV., edd. *Palazky* et *Birk*, Vienn. 1857. *Richerii* Hist. conc. general., libri III., c. 2 sq., T. II., p. 305–670. *Natal. Alex.*, Hist. eccles., saec. XV., diss. VIII. *Hefele*, A glance at the fifteenth century, etc., cf. above, § 270. The *same*, Hist. of Councils. Vol VII., Pt. II., Freiburg, 1874. *Wessenberg*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 271–513. The *Catholic*, 1841, July, Aug., and Sept. numbers.

Eugene's intentions were known to be honest and sincere, and his accession to the papal throne was hailed with joy, as opening a future full of hope to the Church.

Before the election, the cardinals had drawn up a series of articles, requiring the reformation of the Papal Court, and defining the relations of the Pope to the Sacred College, which each bound himself under oath to carry out in case the choice should fall upon him. Eugene, after his elevation, not only stood by this agreement, but also had the articles published in a separate bull.

He did not suffer the conflict of arms which was carried on both within and without the city of Rome, to deter him from entering upon the projected reforms of his predecessors. He convoked the Ecumenical Council to meet at Basle, and confirmed the choice of Martin V., who had appointed Cardinal *Julian Cesarini*, a man distinguished both for learning and a talent for business, to preside over it. But as this cardinal was at the time engaged in endeavoring to bring about an accommodation with the Hussites in Bohemia, the Pope selected two plenipotentiaries, Doctor *John Polemar*, and *John of Ragusa*, a Dominican, to preside in his stead till such time as he should be free to do so himself.

---

[1] Against the authorship of the celebrated Cologne humanist, *Ortwin Gratius*, cf. *Dr. Cremans*, in the Annals of the Histor. Association of the Lower Rhine, and especially of the ancient archdiocese of Cologne, nro. 23, p. 192–224, Cologne, 1871.

The Council was opened July 23, 1431. As yet there were no bishops present, and only a few doctors, canons, and abbots.[1] Cardinal Cesarini, convinced that all efforts to reconcile the Hussites to the Church would involve a useless waste of time and labor, gave up the task as hopeless, and set out on his journey for Basle, where he arrived in the month of September. He sent word to the Pope by John *Beaupère*, a canon of Besançon, that owing to the threatened war between Philip of Burgundy and Frederic of Austria, very few of the bishops were in attendance at the Council; that the heresy of John Huss was rapidly spreading in both these countries, and that the clergy were in consequence exposed to insult and injury.

Eugene, influenced by these representations, and anxious to avail himself of the favorable temper of mind exhibited by the Greeks, who had made proposals for a reunion with the Western Church, but who expressed a wish to meet in some *Italian* town, resolved to suspend the proceedings of the Council of Basle, and announced that the Fathers would convene at Bologna eighteen months later. This bull was dated November 12, A. D. 1431. But learning shortly afterward that the Fathers of Basle had invited the advocates of Huss' doctrine to a discussion of the controverted points, notwithstanding the fact that these had already been formally condemned as heretical, the Pope at once determined to dissolve the Council, which he did December 12, A. D. 1431.[2]

---

[1] Cf. *Mansi's* note to *Raynald.* ad an. 1431, nro. 21.

[2] *Eugenii* ep. ad Julian. Cardin. and Bulla revocationis, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1575 sq. Cf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1431, nr. 21.

The prelates assembled at Basle, who numbered only twelve, either not hearing of the action of the Pope, or disregarding it, went on, and opened the *first session* of the Council, on the 14th day of December.[1] Julian did not even await the return of the messengers whom he had sent to Rome to confer with the Pope on the business of the Council.

The Council, in its first session, declared itself lawfully convened, and proceeded to define its aim and scope, which were said to be *the extinction of heresy, and the closing of the Greek schism; the strengthening of faith, and the establishment of peace among Christian princes; the reformation of the Church in her Head and members, and the revival of ancient discipline.*

To facilitate the transaction of business, all the members of the Council were to be divided into *four bodies*, representing the Italian, French, German, and Spanish nations. From these were to be formed *four committees*, consisting of an equal number of prelates and doctors, selected from the representatives of each nation, who should discuss in turn and adopt or reject every proposed measure, after it had been admitted as a legitimate subject for discussion by another committee of twelve. When any measure had been adopted by one of the four committees, it was to be passed on to the next, and thence to the president of Council, who should propose it at the next of the general congregations, which were to be held weekly. Should it be accepted here also, it was to be cast into the form of decree, and solemnly proclaimed at the next session.

Owing to the small number of those present, this plan could not be carried into effect in the early days of the Council.

When the bull adjourning the Council arrived, in January, 1432, the Fathers expressed great indignation, and even Cardinal Julian urged the necessity of continuing the Council in the city in which it had been first opened.[2] It was argued that if the Council should now close its sittings, such a course would give color of truth to the bitter and slanderous attacks of the Hussites, who might then claim, with apparent justice, that the Fathers of the Church, fearing to meet adversaries so formidable in open discussion, had prudently taken to flight to escape the disgrace of defeat.

---

[1] The acts of this first and following sessions are in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1103 sq., and *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 3 sq.

[2] In *Raynald.* ad a. 1432, nr. 22; more complete in Fasciculus rer. expetend., Colon. 1535, p. 28-32.

Cardinal Julian also represented that the Pope had been induced to issue the bull of dissolution by false and untrustworthy reports, whereupon the Council, insisting on its fancied rights, published an encyclic to the Christian world,[1] in which it declared that it was lawfully convened in the Holy Ghost, and expressed its determination to go on and finish the good work it had commenced.

Some Parisian doctors, carried away by immoderate warmth, asserted that the very thought of dissolving the Council was an inspiration of the devil.

It would seem that the opposition of the Fathers at Basle to any dissolution of the Council was, to some extent, based on worthy motives, and their good intentions secured for them the general approbation of the Catholic world. The French bishops assembled at *Bourges* declared that the Council was a lawfully constituted body, and expressed a purpose of attending it themselves, and of sending a memorial to the Pope, requesting him to allow the Fathers to continue their work for the good of the Church.

The Emperor Sigismund, who had been lately made *King of Bohemia*, was, of all the temporal princes, the most interested in the continuance of the Council. He wrote to the Pope, assuring him that when the Fathers extended the invitation to the Bohemians, there was no intention to discuss disputed points of doctrine, but merely to explain them more fully to the heretics.

The *determination* of the Fathers of Basle and of the temporal princes *to go on with the Council* was strengthened by the persistent refusal of the Pope to yield to their demands. The Council continued to assert that it was a lawfully organized body, and *in the second session*, held February 15th, at which only fourteen bishops were present, *renewed the decrees of the Council of Constance, declaring an Ecumenical Council to be superior to the Pope.* In the *third session*, held April 29th, the Fathers requested the Pope to withdraw his bull dissolving the Council, and summoned both him and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months; or, should he be unable to come himself, to send legates to represent him.

---

[1] *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1315–1317: "Sacrosancta generalis synod. Basil. in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, universalem ecclesiam repraesentans, universis Christi fidelibus."

Nicholas de Cusa, Dean of St. Florinus, at Coblenz, whom Cardinal Julian had called to the Council, and who was afterward created Cardinal and raised to the bishopric of Brixen, was especially conspicuous by the energy and ability with which he defended the course of the Fathers of Basle. Born at Cues, near Treves, he received his early education from the "Brothers of the Common Life," at Deventer, whence he passed to the University of Padua, and there distinguished himself for his ability in the studies of canon and civil law. His proficiency in the two last-named branches, the wide range of his learning, and his extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, mathematics, and philosophy, gained him a great reputation among his contemporaries, who bestowed upon him the honorable title of "*Decretorum Doctor.*"[1]

Nicholas believed that the existing state of the Church imperatively called for an ecumenical council, and had regarded its assemblage at Basle with pleasurable hope. Impressed with this conviction, he wrote his celebrated work "De Concordantia Catholica, Libri Tres," published A. D. 1433, in which he brought forward a great array of historical documents, to sustain the course the Council had hitherto pursued.

---

[1] *Nicolai Cusani* Opp., Basil. 1565, 3 T. f.; hitherto unprinted documents concerning the same, in Tübg. Quart. Review, 1830, p. 171. †*Harzheim*, Vita Nicolai de Cusa., Trevir. 1730. Corrections and additions thereto (Tübg. Quart. Rev. 1831, p. 386). †**Scharpff*, Religious and literary influence of Nicholas de Cusa (in Tübg. *Quart.* 1837, pp. 201 and 287). The *same*, The Cardinal and Bishop Nicholas de Cusa, Mentz, 1843, Pt. I. as Pt. II.: "The most important writings of the Cardinal," in Germ., Freiburg, 1862; Pt. III., 1871. †**Dux*, The German Cardinal, Nicholas de Cusa, and the Church of his Age, Ratisbon, 1847, 2 vols. †*Clemens*, Giordano Bruno and Nichol. Cusa, being a philosophical essay, Bonn. 1847. *Zimmermann*, Nicholas Cusanus, the forerunner of Leibnitz (Vol. VIII. of the Reports of the Philos. and Histor. Department of the Vienna Academy of Sciences, year 1852). †*Jaeger*, The Quarrel of Cardinal Nich. Cusan. with Sigismund, Duke of Austria, Innsbruck, 1861, 2 vols †*Stumpf*, The Political Views of Nich. of Cues, Cologne, 1865.

This work may be regarded as embodying the views of all the great thinkers of that age, such as *Gerson*, *d'Ailly*, *Nicholas de Clemange*, and a host of doctors of inferior name, on the constitution and government of the Church in general; on the relations of the Pope to an ecumenical council, and to the bishops, and of the spiritual to the temporal authority. An analysis of this work will, therefore, not be out of place here, at least of that part of it which treats of the relation of the Pope to an ecumenical council.

The Church, says *Nicholas de Cusa*,[1] is the living union in Christ, and through Christ of all intelligent beings,[2] who thus constitute His mystical Body.[3] Hence, the Church is *one* both in essence and character, but her members are divided into three classes, corresponding to the three states of the Church—namely, the Church *militant*, the Church *suffering*, and the Church *triumphant*.[4] Again, the Sacraments, the Priesthood, and the Laity are the three elements of the Church militant essential to the preservation of union among her members. The Sacraments are channels through which, by the ministration of the priesthood, the grace of Jesus Christ is conveyed to the laity; and this priestly ministration is as essential as a medium of communication between Christ, the Spiritual Head of the Church, and the body of the faithful, as is the ministration of the soul in man for maintaining the proper relations between spirit and matter. The *priesthood*, therefore, guided as it is by the Holy Ghost, is truly the soul of the Body of the Faithful,[5] its very office being to direct, quicken, and enlighten the Body.

As there are different faculties in the human soul, so also are there different orders and varying degrees in the priesthood, and the highest of these is the *episcopacy*.[6] As regards orders and jurisdiction, all bishops are absolutely equal, and whatever distinction exists among them rises out of the peculiar character of the administrative authority of each, or is dependent on the special conditions of the Church over which each is set. The distinctions of rank and precedence, and the more or less ample authority enjoyed by the several bishops, are determined by the greater or less importance of the churches over which they are respectively placed. The formation of the Church's constitution after this fashion was *not the issue of chance*, but the work of design, *its origin being due to Divine appointment and apostolic ordinance*. The same overseeing Providence was pleased that Rome, which had of old been the center of error, should in these latter days become the center of truth, and *that its bishops should be set over all the others.*[1] And, in matter of fact, Christ Himself set Peter over all the other apostles, that through him division might be avoided, unity preserved, and the whole Church be linked by the bonds of love to a living center.[2] This dignity and prerogative became the inalienable right of the See of Rome, and passed on unimpaired, from St. Peter to his successors, through all succeeding ages;[3] and hence whosoever has broken the bond of union with the Bishop of Rome is outside the Church.[4]

---

[1] This analysis by *Hefele* (in the *Giessen Annuary* of Theol., Vol. VI., p. 361–368).

[2] Lib. I., c. 1.

[3] Lib. II., c. 18.

[4] Lib. I., c. 4.

[5] Lib. I., c. 8.

[6] Lib. I., c. 6.

In all *matters of faith*, an *ecumenical* council is the supreme and infallible authority,[5] inasmuch as it represents the priesthood of the universal Church, to which Christ committed the power of binding and loosing, and bestowed the gift of infallibility.[6] An ecumenical council does not, therefore, derive its authority from him who has the right of convoking it, and whose right ceases *once the council has been constituted*, but directly and immediately *from Christ.* Neither is it essential that the Pope should convoke an ecumenical council, for the first eight councils, though truly ecumenical in character, were not convoked by Popes.[7] Neither does the president of a council give binding force to its decrees. All that is essential to this end is the harmonious and unanimous assent of the Fathers, directed by the guidance of the Holy Ghost and assisted by the presence of Jesus Christ in their midst.[8]

As *unanimity* is a condition of truth, every member is an integral part of the Council, and no one possessing a right to be there can be either refused admittance into it, or, once there, be ejected.[9] The right of participating in a council and of casting a *definitive* vote is confined to the *bishops* or their *plenipotentiaries.* But, aside from absolute right, it is a wise and wholesome practice to summon to a council learned priests and doctors of canon law whose wisdom and ability may be of service to the Fathers.[10]

The right of framing decrees of such a character as will bind the whole Church, without distinction of persons, is confined exclusively to an ecumenical council,[11] because the very office of such an assembly is to give expression to the wants of the whole Church and to provide the best means for her government.

---

[1] Lib. I., c. 5–15

[2] Lib. I., c. 11.

[3] These and other like utterances are not indeed calculated to support what *Gieseler* says in his Text-book of Ch. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 62—viz., that the concordantia catholica of *Nich. of Cusa* contains propositions "menacing the very foundations of the papacy." *Brockhaus*, Nic. Cusani de concil. universal. potestate sententia explicatur, Lps. 1867. Conf. Scharpff, Pt. III.; cf. Bonn. Review of Theol. Lit., nro. 7, year 1872.

[4] Lib. I., c. 14, 15.

[5] Lib. II., c. 5.

[6] Lib. II., c. 18.

[7] Lib. II., c. 25.

[8] Lib. II., c. 8, 9.

[9] Lib. II., c. 15.

[10] Lib. II., c. 16, 23.

[11] Lib. II., c. 9.

The Pope, inasmuch as he is the Chief Pastor of the whole Church and her accredited representative upon earth, has also the right of framing *decrees*, but these neither bind the intellects and consciences of the faithful nor carry with them a sanction equal to those of an ecumenical council until after they have been promulgated to the whole Catholic world and accepted by it. The Pope's supremacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church once admitted, it follows as a consequence that neither a particular nor an ecumenical council can lawfully convene without his consent and sanction.[1] The Pope and an ecumenical council both represent the Church—the latter accurately and adequately, since its voice is the expression of the assembled pastors of the Christian world; the former in a confused, and consequently less precise and complete sense. Inasmuch, therefore, as the judgments of an ecumenical council express the sense of the universal Church with fullness and accuracy, they are more reliable than those of the Pope, and should receive more ready acceptance.[2] And, although the Pope possesses the right to preside at an ecumenical council, he is, for all that, but a fraction of it; and as the whole is greater than any of its parts,[3] *so also is a council superior to the Pope.*[4]

History is a witness to this superiority of an ecumenical council, and the most distinguished among the Popes have themselves freely admitted such to be the case. The decrees of an ecumenical council are as binding upon the Pope as upon any other member of the Church of Christ. He is not only obliged to give them the same willing obedience that others give; but, as *St. Leo* says, since such decrees are inspired by God, the Pope has a duty of *first* obeying them himself, that his prompt submission to God and to His Holy Church may serve as an example to others. Having done this much himself, he has the further duty of seeing to it that these decrees are observed by others also.[5]

Still, there are some cases of extraordinary emergency and pressing necessity, in which the good of the Church requires that some general ordinance of an ecumenical council should be dispensed with; and in such cases the Pope has the faculty to dispense; provided, however, he take counsel with the cardinals before proceeding to act, when the affair is of grave importance.[6]

As regards the limits of the authority which an ecumenical council may exercise over a Pope, this much seems to be established, that he may be deposed by his inferiors if he adhere to a *heresy* which has been once condemned. There is but one rule in this matter, applicable alike to him and every other member of the Church; for heresy, of its very nature, is such that a Pope, by the simple fact of embracing it (*eo ipso*), not only deprives himself of all claims to his office, but also puts himself outside the Church by his own act.

Whether crimes of another nature, though of a serious character, constitute sufficient ground for deposition, admits of grave doubt. The more generally accepted opinion runs counter to such a supposition, on the ground that no spiritual superior can be lawfully deposed either by his inferiors or by a synod convoked by his authority, and maintains that when an instance of this sort occurs, the superior must, in any event, be borne with, and, if possible, be reformed. But this principle, though held by many, must be put aside when there is question of the relations between the Pope and an ecumenical council;[1] *for an ecumenical council, being of its very nature above the Pope, must, as a consequence, possess the general right of passing judgment upon him*, and, if so, of deposing him for crimes other than that of heresy. The very aim and scope of a council being to remove abuses, it must possess the further power and authority, which such purpose implies, of bringing the cause of these abuses to judgment, even though he should be the Pope himself.[2] But, while possessing this supreme authority, the Council should never lose sight of the exalted position of the august Head of the Church—should proceed against him with that respectful reverence due to his character and office, and should first employ every reasonable measure of conciliation and have recourse to its deposing power only in very extreme cases.

---

[1] Lib. II., c. 15.
[2] Lib. II., c. 18.
[3] Lib. II., c. 15.
[4] Lib. II., c. 17.
[5] Lib. II., c. 20.
[6] Lib. II., c. 21.

Such were the views that had swayed the Fathers of Basle from the commencement of the Council, and upon which they still continued to act. Cardinal Julian had resigned his office of president of the Council in January, on receipt of the papal bull closing its sessions and transferring it to Bologna; but fearing that great evils might follow if the instructions of the Pope were carried into execution, he pressed upon him the necessity of acknowledging the Council. The Fathers went on with their work, and in the *fourth session* (June 20, A. D. 1432), granted letters of safe conduct to the Bohemians and prescribed rules for the direction of the Pope's conduct.

The archbishops *Andrew of Colocza* and *John of Tarento*,[3] who came to Basle as papal nuncios, were admitted to an audience on the 22d of August, and protested, but in vain, against this spirit of hostility to the Pope. The Emperor *Sigismund* also besought the Fathers to become reconciled to the Pope, but his attempts were equally ineffectual; they would hear none of this. They addressed a harsh letter to Eugene, in which they charged him with being the author of the schism, and set forth their own claims to be recognized as a Council lawfully convened in the Holy Ghost (*synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata*), and possessing the plenitude of conciliar authority. The Council, in its *sixth session* (September 6th), at which there were present but thirty-two bishops, went the length of moving, through its promoters, that the Pope should be declared *obstinate* (*contumax*).

---

[1] Lib. II., c. 17.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] See these discourses in *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 468–492; *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1518–1540. Archbishop Andrew places at the head of his discourse those words of the apostle: "Non sit schisma in corpore."

The pretensions of the Council increased as time went on, and so reckless were the means adopted by the Fathers to create a public opinion adverse to the Pope, that they did not hesitate to give currency to the most damaging and unfounded reports regarding his moral character. Cardinal Julian again resumed the presidency of the Council in the *seventh session* (November 5th), when it was enacted that in the event of the Holy See becoming vacant, the election of the new Pope should take place *only at Basle;* and in the eighth session, a term of sixty days was prescribed to Eugene, as the extreme limit before the expiration of which he was charged to recall his bull of dissolution. Finally, in the *tenth session* (February 19, A. D. 1433), a decree was passed declaring the Pope both disobedient and *obstinate.*

Eugene, believing that the obstacles which, as he at first thought, stood in the way of the salutary action of the Council, had now passed away, began to regard its continuance with more favor, and entered upon a line of conduct looking toward reconciliation with the Fathers of Basle.[1] He published a bull, dated August 1, A. D. 1433, by which he revoked his former decree of dissolution. He also signified his intention of taking part in the Council, and instructed his legates to enter upon the preliminary measures necessary to that end.

The Fathers of Basle, on the contrary, showed no disposition to make peace, and so immoderate were their pretensions, that they still insisted that the Council represented the universal Church (*universalem Ecclesiam repraesentans*), rejected the greater part of the papal propositions, and took exception to some expressions contained in the bull of August 1st. The Pope had there said "*we will and are content*" that the Council shall continue, instead of which he was required to say "we decree and declare" (*decernimus et declaramus*). It was further claimed that, in his instructions to his legates, Eugene had made use of offensive terms, which should also be corrected; and that the principle implied in his proposal to conduct all business with the advice of the Council (*cum consilio Concilii*), could not be admitted, inasmuch as by its admission the Fathers, from being judges, would sink to the unimportant rank of advisers.

---

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1433, nr. 19 sq. The bulls of Eugene are in *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 574; *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1168–1172. Cf. *Mansi*, l. c., p. 72 sq.

The Fathers continued, from the eleventh to the fifteenth session, to pass decrees derogatory to the dignity of the Pope, and designed to weaken his authority. Many of the Italian princes taking advantage of the embarrassing condition of Eugene, and under pretext of protecting the Council, carried war into every quarter of the Papal States, seized fortified places, and took possession of entire provinces. Eugene went on making concession after concession, till he finally consented to subscribe a document drawn up by the Fathers in which it was asserted that the Council had been from the beginning a lawfully convened body. This having been read to the Council in the *sixteenth session* (February 5, 1434), the Fathers, in their turn, permitted the papal legates to preside, and in the seventeenth session (April 26, A. D. 1434), *recalled everything that had been said against either the person of the Pope or the dignity of his office.*[1]

These mutual concessions restored peace to the Council, and gained for it the respect and reverence of the Catholic world. The presence of the Emperor *Sigismund* in Basle contributed not a little to bring about this happy result.

While the very existence of the Council was a matter of doubt, and seemed to depend upon the issue of the oft-renewed controversies on the principles of authority, it is not wonderful that no progress should have been made toward accomplishing the purpose for which it was primarily convoked; but since peace reigned once more, and, in consequence, the Fathers were daily receiving fresh accessions to their numbers, it should seem that now at least the Council would apply itself with energy and zeal to *the extinction of heresy, the reunion and reconciliation of all Christians, and the reformation of the Church.*

---

[1] Such is the account given by an eye-witness—*Augustinus Patricius*—who relates it in his Summa Conciliorum.

It was not long, however, before it became painfully evident that the Fathers, while professing to be reconciled to the Pope, had no intention either of giving up their former doctrines or of forsaking their factious leaders. In the *seventeenth session* they declared that the papal legates possessed no *coercive authority*, and in the *eighteenth* (June 26, A. D. 1434), again brought forward the decree of Constance, in which the jurisdiction of an ecumenical council is declared to be superior to that of the Pope. The time, too, seemed favorable for the Fathers to bring on such a measure. The Duke of Milan was fomenting and abetting rebellion in the States of the Church, and so closely was the Pope pressed, that he was obliged to escape in disguise to Florence.

In the *nineteenth session* (September 7th), some advance was made toward the real work for which the Council had avowedly convened. It was proposed to hold a Council in Italy, at which the Pope, the Greek Emperor, the Oriental Patriarchs, and Bishops should be present, and in which such measures should be taken as would bring about the union of the Eastern and Western Churches.

In the *twentieth* and following sessions a number of *stringent reformatory decrees* were passed; some against the practice of *concubinage* among the clergy, and the *abuse of appeals* and *interdicts*; others providing for the abolition of *annats*, and of those *unbecoming practices* and *sacrilegious disorders* that took place in certain churches, and of which the Fools' Feasts, banquets, and fairs were the occasion; and still others, whose special purpose was to insure the *worthy and becoming celebration of the Divine service.* The Fathers also gave particular attention to the mode of procedure in future conclaves for the election of a Pope, specified the qualifications requisite in a candidate, and prescribed the oath to be taken and the profession of faith to be read. They moreover enacted special laws to which the College of Cardinals were expected to conform.

In the sixteenth session provision had already been made for the regular holding of *diocesan* synods and *provincial councils.* The excessive zeal of the Fathers for reform hurried them beyond the limits of decency and justice, when, in the *twenty-third session* (March 25, 1436), they passed decrees which, if carried into execution, would reduce the Papal See to a state of degrading servitude and annihilate the last semblance of the Pope's authority, whose exercise in deciding canonical elections is frequently so necessary.[1] They attempted to cut off from him sources of revenue without which he would be unable, not indeed to maintain the dignity of his station, but to meet the necessary expenses of his office; and to deprive him of rights and prerogatives which were peculiarly and essentially his own. Measures so ungenerous and illegal excited the suspicions and cooled the ardor of the warmest and most tried friends of the Council. *Nicholas de Cusa* was the first to perceive that a change in public opinion was setting in. To add to the growing discontent, the Fathers, while despoiling the Pope of his *annats and the tribute* paid to the Roman See, when benefices were conferred and confirmed, authorized a tax to be levied on the inferior clergy for the maintenance of the Council, thus appropriating to their use revenues to which they had no claim, and crying down as an abuse their payment to the Holy See, whose right to them was unquestionable. Even this was not the most flagrant violation on their part of the reformatory measures which they prescribed to the Pope, and of the decrees of Constance, to which they so frequently and confidently appealed.

They went so far as to propose to put indulgences on sale for the purpose of obtaining the sums requisite to carry forward the contemplated measures for the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.

The papal legates and some among the most distinguished Fathers of the Council protested against this mode of raising money, as one directly opposed to the spirit of the Church, fraught with dangerous consequences, and calculated to bring dishonor upon the whole body of the clergy.

---

[1] Aeneas Sylvius, speaking from personal knowledge, says: "Against *one* unworthy individual nominated by the Pope to some office, I am ready, at any time, to adduce a thousand instances of rude, stupid, and utterly unfit men promoted by chapters and ordinaries."

Eugene IV., convinced that there was no hope of coming to terms with the Fathers of Basle, addressed an encyclic to the European sovereigns, in which he condemned the irregular proceedings of the Council against the person and office of the Pope. He particularly insisted on the acts of the *twenty-third session*, in which the Council had prescribed the mode of procedure in the future election of Popes; regulated the smallest details of the Papal government, and drawn up a profession of faith, embodying the offensive decrees of Constance and Basle, affirming the superiority of an ecumenical council to a Pope. He also said that the Council had taken up a number of subjects which of their nature were beyond its competency, and had interfered in the political issues that then distracted Europe, thus prejudicing, by such imprudent action, the main purpose for which it had been convoked. The Pope had serious thoughts at this time of either dissolving the Council altogether or transferring it to some other city.

In the meantime *negotiations* had been going forward looking *toward the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches*. The majority of the Fathers of Basle were in favor of having the Council meet at Basle, Avignon, or some city of Savoy, while the papal legates, and the more influential among the prelates, proposed that it should be held at either Florence, Udine, or some other Italian city. The Greek embassador also preferred one of the latter places, which, he said, would possess the double advantage of being more convenient to the Pope and more easily accessible to his own countrymen. Eugene, upon these representations, approved the suggestion of his legates, and decided in favor of holding the Council in an Italian city. When the news of his decision reached Basle, the Fathers were so indignant that they put aside even the simulated respect which they had thus far observed when speaking of the Head of the Church. Eugene was charged with grave offenses, though there was not a shred of evidence to prove his guilt; and in the *twenty-sixth session* (July 31, A. D. 1437), both he and the cardinals were cited to appear before the Council of Basle, to answer for their conduct, within sixty days. The Pope of course paid no attention to this citation, and in consequence the Basilians, in the *twenty-eighth session* (October 1st), declared him contumacious.

Eugene issued a bull, dated September 11, 1437, and begining "*Doctor Gentium*," by which he transferred the Council to *Ferrara*, to enter upon the work of the reunion of the two Churches. All the prelates at Basle were invited to attend, but some excused their absence under pretext that one of the disputed articles still remained to be settled with the Hussites.

The fury of these latter increased in proportion as the numbers, authority, and importance of the Council opened at Ferrara augmented, and hence, from the twenty-fourth session onward until its close, the Catholic world ceased to regard the Synod of Basle as possessing *an ecumenical character*.[1]

They, however, claimed that their assembly was truly ecumenical, and to all appearances there were now two general councils in session, each of which declared the decrees of the other null and void, and each held threats of excommunication over those prelates who should continue to participate in the acts of the other.

Cardinal L'Allemand, Archbishop of Arles, a man of great energy of character and determination, was now the leading spirit at Basle, and in the *twenty-ninth session*, the Fathers, acting under his powerful influence, declared void the papal bull dissolving the Council, and threatened to depose Eugene if he would not consent to recall it. They were not deterred by the fewness of their numbers from carrying their threat into execution, and in the *thirty-first session* (January 24, A. D. 1438), although reduced to twenty-five bishops and seventeen abbots, declared the Pope *suspended*, and incapable of exercising the functions of his office; and, as a consequence of this, in the thirty-second session (March 24th), pronounced the Council of Ferrara a *schismatical conventicle*, and cited its members to appear personally within thirty days before the tribunal of Basle.

---

[1] *Bellarminus*, De eccles. militante, c. 16: "Dico, Basileense Concilium initio quidem fuisse legitimum; nam et Legatus aderat Romani Pontificis et Episcopi plurimi; at a quo tempore Eugenium deposuit et Felicem elegit, non fuit concilium eccl., sed conciliabulum schismaticum, seditiosum et nullius prorsus auctoritatis." Cf. *Idem* de Concilior. auctoritate, c. 16.

Even the *personal* enemies of the Pope, such as the King of Aragon and the Duke of Milan, censured this silly arrogance; the Duke of Bavaria declared war against the Basilians, as they were now called; and the King of England asserted that they had brought on the age of Antichrist.

The electors of Germany, who were then assembled at Frankfort, for the purpose of electing a king, expressed a determination to remain *neutral* until they should have completed their own work; but when, on the 17th of March, A. D. 1438, the choice fell upon Albert of Austria, they did not attempt to conceal their discontent with the Fathers of Basle. Notwithstanding that France had forbidden her bishops to attend the Council of Ferrara, many of them disregarded the prohibition, and an *assembly* of the clergy held at *Bourges* endeavored to bring about a reconciliation between the two parties.

The Basilians, either unconscious that the tide of public opinion in Catholic Europe was setting against them, or rendered desperate and reckless by the hopelessness of their cause, continued their opposition to the Pope. They exhausted every effort to fix the note of heresy upon Eugene, that they might have a specious pretext for deposing him. For this purpose they framed, in the *thirty-third session* (May 16, A. D. 1439), and after a stormy debate succeeded in promulgating, eight so-called articles of faith (*fidei Catholicae veritates*), to which they knew Eugene would not subscribe. The drift of these was that an ecumenical council was above the Pope, and that Eugene, having acted contrary to this fundamental principle in several instances, should be branded with the note of heresy.[1] The Basilians, having defined what constituted heresy, and declared that Eugene was guilty of it, saw the rest of their way clear before them. They deposed the Pope in the *thirty-fourth session* (June 26th), and in the *thirty-fifth* (July 8th), after solemnly affirming the necessity of continuing the Council, proceeded to elect his successor. They were careful, in making their choice, to select a person who, by his wealth and connections, might relieve the financial embarrassments of the Council, and regain the influence which it was rapidly losing in every royal house in Europe. Such a one was found in *Amadeus VIII. of Savoy*, who, three years before, had resigned his crown in favor of his son, and withdrawn, with a body of knights, whom he organized into the Order of St. Maurice, to the pleasant town of Ripailles, on the shores of Lake Geneva. He took the name of *Felix V.*, and was recognized by his own hereditary states, by the kings of Aragon and Hungary, and by a few German princes, and a number of universities. *Albert II.* had died November 5, A. D. 1439, while these events were going forward, and his cousin, *Frederic III.*, ascended the throne.

---

[1] The first three ran thus: 1. Veritas est cath. fidei, st. generale Conc. supra Papam et alium quemvis potestatem habere; 2. Generale Concilium legitime congregatum sine ipsius consensu nec dissolvere, nec transferre, nec prorogare ad tempus ex auctoritate sua potest Romanus Pontifex, idque veritatis ejusdem est; 3. Qui pertinaciter his veritatibus se opponit, haereticus est censendus.

Now that an antipope was elected, it was further necessary to supply money for his own support and for the proper maintenance of a court becoming his dignity; and, to meet this demand, the same assembly which, but a short time before, had indignantly protested against the abuse of annats, and in consequence abolished them, now gave its sanction to levies incomparably more burdensome. Permission was given to Felix V. to impose a tax of one-fifth for the coming five years, and of one-tenth for the next ensuing five, upon the revenues of all ecclesiastical benefices.

These high-handed proceedings excited public indignation against the Basilians; and even those of their own number most distinguished for learning and ability—such as Cardinal Julian; Nicholas, Archbishop of Palermo; *Nicholas de Cusa;* and even *Aeneas Sylvius*, who had been the secretary and the most eloquent defender of the Council of Basle, and, in the year 1440, secretary to the antipope Felix V.—now passed over to the other side. As the authority of the assembly of Basle declined, its advocates became proportionately bold and reckless; but such behavior only contributed to strip it of what little prestige it still possessed, and to make the few remaining sessions excessively wearisome to the members themselves. When, at length, Felix V. withdrew from Basle to Lausanne, under pretext of restoring his health, the Fathers, in the *forty-fifth session* (May 16, A. D. 1443), brought the proceedings to a close.

Such was the end of a Council which, in its early days, entered with commendable zeal and energy upon the work of reform, possessed the confidence and commanded the respect of many, and was so full of promise to the Church. Weakened by internal dissensions and by the gradual defection of its members, and animated by a stubborn spirit of disobedience, it brought on its own dissolution, and, in its last days, became the very scourge of the Church.

We shall have occasion to speak, in paragraph 278, of the continuation of this Council at Ferrara and Florence.

Owing to the complicated condition of affairs at Basle, a diet assembled at *Mentz*, in March, A. D. 1439, at which there were present three ecclesiastical electors, and the embassadors of the kings of France, Castile, and Portugal, and of the Duke of Milan. The cause of Eugene was ably and eloquently defended by *John Turrecremata*[1] and *Nicholas de Cusa*, both among the most eminent men of that age. The former made a brilliant speech, in which he showed the contradictory character and logical inconsistency of the position taken by the Fathers of Basle, who contended that there was a clear distinction between the Head of the Church dispersed and the Head of the Church assembled in an ecumenical council; and that the Pope, while truly the Head of the Church in the former sense, was not so in the latter. In other words, they contended that, though the Pope was, in true sense, the supreme Head of the Catholic Church, scattered over the world and considered both individually and collectively, he could lay no claim to this prerogative when the same church spoke through her representatives assembled in an ecumenical council.

---

[1] *Joan. de Turrecremata* (Dominican and Magister S. Palatii), Tractatus notabilis de potestate papae et concilii generalis, Coloniae, 1480; de pontificis maximi conciliique generalis auctoritate, in *Harduini* Acta concil., T. IX., p. 1235 sq.; summa de ecclesia et ejus auctoritate, libri IV. (Lugd. 1496; Venet. 1561.) On his other numerous writings, cf. *Nicol. Antonio*, Bibliotheca vetus Hispan., ed. *Bayer*, T. II., p. 286-293.

Turrecremata also showed the absurdity of asserting that a council *without* the Pope, *its* legitimate *Head*, could represent the Church. But, for all this, the diet approved, with some modifications, the reformatory decrees of Basle, and, following the example of the French assembly at Bourges, drew up a pragmatic sanction, or royal edict, enforcing their observance. The diet, however, entered its protest against the decree of Basle suspending the Pope from the exercise of his temporal and spiritual authority, and reserved any further proceeding in relation to him to a future ecumenical council.

The Basilians replied that the maintenance of the principle of the superiority of an ecumenical council to the Pope, was an essential condition to the safety and well-being of the Church, and that, since Eugene had frequently violated this principle in the past, it would be necessary to again take action against him should he attempt anything of the kind in the future.

A second diet was held *at Mentz*, A. D. 1441, under the Emperor *Frederic III.*, when the papal legates again took up the defense of Eugene, maintaining that his deposition by the Basilians had been irregular; first, because only seven bishops voted in favor of it, whereas the ecclesiastical canons require the unanimous verdict of twelve to depose a simple *bishop;* and secondly, because open and avowed *heresy*[1] is the only crime justifying the deposition of a Pope. Influenced by these considerations, the diet expressed itself in favor of convoking an ecumenical council.

A *diet of princes* was held at Frankfort-on-Main, A. D. 1442, at which *Nicholas de Cusa* again appeared as the advocate of the Pope. What sort of claim, said he, can this pretended Council of Basle lay to the title of ecumenical? Have not its labors tended to destroy such title altogether? Has it not done all in its power to divide the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, by attempting to place the tiara on the head of a layman and a temporal prince?

---

[1] It is not intended here to imply that the Pope, when teaching the universal Church and speaking *ex cathedra*, can, by any possibility, fall into error in treating of faith and morals, or subjects connected with them. If any serious doubt of this proposition were ever entertained, it has been forever set at rest by the Vatican Council. (Tr.)

The reasoning of the cardinal was so conclusive and consistent that *Frederic III.* and the majority of the princes acknowledged the authority of Eugene, thus inflicting a deathblow upon the assembly at Basle, whose dissolution, as has been said, speedily followed.

But Eugene's troubles were not yet over. He was obliged to sustain a fresh struggle with the *diet of the electors*, who *assembled at Frankfort*, in the months of May and September, A. D. 1446.

In the preceding year, the Pope had deposed the archbishops and electors of Cologne and Treves, who for a time had observed a neutral policy between the contending parties, but finally took sides with the antipope. Their sees were given to two relatives of the powerful Duke of Burgundy. The diet protested against this proceeding, as an illegal exercise of papal authority, and in consequence drew up four articles, one of which asserted the superiority of an ecumenical council to a Pope, which were presented to Eugene for his signature, with a threat, that, if he should refuse, the diet would declare in favor of the antipope Felix V. It is evident from this act that the diet, in deciding upon the controversy, was not guided by any principle of justice or sense of duty, but was ready to declare in favor of either claimant who would make the largest concessions.

The Emperor Frederic refused to approve the proceedings of the diet, but consented to send *Aeneas Sylvius dei Piccolomini* to represent him in the embassy which had been appointed to go to Rome and confer with the Pope.

At the head of this embassy was the notorious *Gregory of Heimburg*, the syndic of the free city of Nürnberg, who, mistaking boorishness and rudeness for frankness and simplicity, approached the Pope with arrogant assurance, and laid before him the demands of the electors, with the statement that upon his answer would depend the character of the resolutions to be adopted on the reassembling of the diet at Frankfort in the ensuing month of September.[1] Eugene at first refused to treat with him at all, but upon the advice of Aeneas Sylvius, promised to send a definite answer to the diet. When the diet assembled in September, A. D. 1446, Aeneas Sylvius, who had, during his visit to Rome, become reconciled to Eugene, together with the papal legate, *Thomas of Sarzano*, Bishop of Bologna, a man of even temper and gentle disposition, lately created Cardinal by Eugene, and his colleagues, *Nicholas de Cusa* and the Spanish *Carvajal*, succeeded in bringing about an understanding between the electors and the Pope. The document setting forth the conditions of agreement is known as the "*Concordat of the Princes*."[2]

The princes admitted that a profession of neutrality in matters of faith was something entirely unheard of among Christians, and they accordingly disclaimed any such position. This peace, which was indeed no more than a compromise based upon mutual concessions, was confirmed by Pope Eugene in four separate bulls issued shortly before his death, which occurred February 23, A. D. 1447. But while thus ratifying the action of the diet, Eugene was careful to guard the rights of the Church, by issuing another bull about the same time containing a proviso, the effect of which was to make the ratification of the concordat between the Holy See and the Germans conditional. In this bull Eugene expressly stated that should the concordat be found to contain any article injurious to the Church, such article should be regarded, and was declared to be, null and void. Eugene was led to take this prudential measure by the representations of some of the cardinals, who expressed a fear that the articles of the concordat might be found to restrict too much the liberty of the Holy See. Thomas of Sarzano, Bishop of Bologna, was chosen to succeed to Eugene, and took the name of *Nicholas V.* (A. D. 1447–1455.) Being a man of liberal tastes, a strong advocate of the revival of classic literature and Christian antiquities, and the founder of the Vatican Library,[1] he commanded universal respect, and was shortly recognized by the whole Catholic world as the true Pope. Even the antipope, Felix V., was persuaded to resign his supposed claims to the papal dignity, and, in the year 1449, submitted to the obedience of Nicholas.

---

[1] Concerning Gregory of Heimburg, conf. †*Düx*, Nich. de Cusa, in several places, and in the *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, Vol. IV., p. 733–736; French transl. Vol. 10, p. 109–112; *Brockhaus*, Gregory of Heimburg, being a contribution toward the Hist. of Germany during the fifteenth century, Lps. 1861.

[2] Concordata Principum, in *Horix*, Concordata Nat. Germ. integra, Frcf. et Lps., ed. II., 1772 sq., T. I. Eugene's bulls, in *C. W. Koch*, Sanctio pragmatica Germanor. illustrata. Argent. 1789, 4to, with the Sylloge documentorum, in *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 97–114. Conf. *Aeneae Sylv.* Hist. *in Koch*, p. 301–309, and *Raynald.* ad an. 1447, nr. 4 sq.; above all, see *Scharpff*, Nichol. de Cusa, Pt. I., p. 144–147.

The Basilians, some of whom still continued the pretense of holding a council, having, under threat of Frederic III., been driven out of Basle, and withdrawn to Lausanne, seeing themselves deserted on all hands, resolved to die as they had lived, and their last acts consisted in the magnanimous approval of papal conduct which they had no longer the power to resist. After having generously removed all the censures they had passed during the continuance of the schism, they accepted the resignation of Felix, and, as if there existed no Pope, very prudently declared Nicholas the object of their choice.

The newly elected Pope, being a man of a conciliatory disposition and a lover of peace, succeeded in bringing about an accommodation between Germany and the Holy See. He declared, with commendable candor, that though the Council of Basle had attempted to strip the Holy See of its undoubted rights, it could not be denied that the excessive use of papal power in restricting the exercise of episcopal authority had given the Fathers reasonable ground for complaint, and that this should be taken into account as an extenuating circumstance in forming a judgment upon their extreme measures.

A separate treaty, known as the "*Concordat of Aschaffenburg*,"[2] and entered upon the statute-book of the empire under this name, was made at Vienna, February 17, A. D. 1448, between the papal legate, Cardinal Carvajal, on the part of the

---

[1] *Janotti Manetti* Vita Nicol. V. (*Muratori*, T. III., P. II., p. 905 sq.) *Georgii* Vita Nicol. V. ad fidem vett. monument., Rom. 1742, 4to. *Papencordt*, l. c., p. 482 sq. and 499 sq.; *Reumont* III. 1, p. 110–126; *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., p. 100–146.

[2] In *Würdtwein*, Subsid. diplom., T. IX., nro. 9, p. 78, and in *Koch*, p. 201 sq.

Pope, and the Emperor Frederic. In this it was stipulated that the reformatory decrees of Basle, which Eugene had accepted upon certain conditions, should not be considered as binding; that the Holy See should enjoy a more ample jurisdiction in conferring high ecclesiastical dignities, and that a moderate fixed tax should take the place of the annats formerly paid to the Pope when benefices were conferred.

Notwithstanding the attachment of France to the cause of Eugene, the diet of *Bourges*, held A. D. 1438, accepted the reformatory decrees of Basle, alleging that their provisions were specially applicable to the condition of the Church in that country, and enforced their observance in a document consisting of twenty-three articles, and known as the *Pragmatic Sanction.*[1] To give it an historical basis, the supposed *Sanctio Pragmatica* of King St. Louis was now (first) invoked.[2]

The consequence of this step soon became apparent in the great number of appeals (*appellatio tanquam ab abusu*) from ecclesiastical authority to the national parliament. So numerous and vexatious did these become, that Charles VII. and Louis XI. were forced to restrict them; and even *Fleury*, Gallican as he was, said "that these appeals, in *spiritual* affairs, from ecclesiastical to civil authority, instead of being regarded as among the liberties of the Gallican Church, should be looked upon rather as a mark of her *servitude.*"

Nicholas had published, A. D. 1453, a general crusade against the Turks, who were threatening Constantinople, and his last hours were embittered by the news that the city had fallen into their hands. He had sent a fleet, under the command of the Archbishop of Ragusa, to the aid of the Greeks; which, unfortunately, did not arrive at its destination until after the city had been taken, May 29, A. D. 1453. When he was at the point of death, he said: "When I was Thomas Sarzano, I had more joy in a single day than now in a whole year." Nicholas died A. D. 1455.

---

[1] Histoire de la sanction pragmatique (Traités des droits et libertés de l'église Gallicane, Paris, 1731 f. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., p. 327. *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, Vol. VIII., p. 638 sq.; French transl., Vol. 19, p. 5, art. Pragmatique Sanction.

[2] See p. 602.

C.—THE LAST POPES OF THIS PERIOD—FIFTH COUNCIL OF LATERAN.

The biographies by *Platina*, continued from Sixtus IV. to Pius V., by the Augustinian, *F. Onofrio Panvinio* († 1568), Ven. 1594 and 1703. *Steph. Infessura* (chancellor at Rome, about 1494), Diarium Romanae urbis 1294–1494 (*Eccard.*, T. II., incomplete, in *Muratori*, T. III., P. II., p. 1109 sq.) *Jac. Volaterrani* Diarium Rom. (1474–1484), in *Murat.*, T. XXIII., p. 86 sq. Hist. of the City of Rome, by *Papencordt*, p. 486 sq.; by *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., p. 146; by *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 126 sq.

§ 273. *Calixtus III.* (A. D. 1455–1458)—*Pius II.* (A. D. 1458–1464)—*Paul II.* (A. D. 1464–1471)—*Sixtus IV.* (A. D. 1471–1484)—*Innocent VIII.* (A. D. 1484–1492)—*Alexander VI.* (A. D. 1492–1503.)

The Popes, who alone, at this time, seemed to have any concern for the welfare of the Church and the safety of Christendom, appealed to the princes of Europe in favor of a crusade to repel the encroachments of the Turks. No one was found to answer to their call. Selfish interests had stifled every generous impulse, and the noble enthusiasm of former days had died away amid the sluggish indolence of the age. Every thought seemed fixed upon the present; no one looked beyond himself or out into the future. Hungary and Poland were seriously threatened. The latter revived again the gallantry and heroism of the crusaders, and, bearing aloft the standard of the Cross, on which was inscribed the legend, "Onward for the Faith" ("*Wiara Naprzod*"), they threw themselves, with the *magnanimous devotion* of heroes, against the approaching tide of the Turks.

Nicholas V. was succeeded by Cardinal Alphonsus Borgia, a *Spaniard*, who took the name of Calixtus III. St. Vincent Ferrer had foretold the elevation of Alphonsus, who, in consequence, while still a cardinal, bound himself by vow to put forth every energy, when he should have succeeded to the papal throne, to wrest Constantinople from the dominion of the Turks. Hence, with the aid of the princes of Europe, he raised and supplied an army to be sent against the Turks, which contributed materially to the great victory gained by the Christians at Belgrade.[1] That the undertaking might have a happy issue, he was accustomed to assemble the faithful, by the ringing of the Angelus every day at noon, to implore the aid of the God of battles.

Calixtus was also a man of cultivated mind and refined tastes, a lover of both Christian and Pagan literature, and, continuing the work commenced by his predecessor, is justly regarded as sharing with him the honor of having founded the Vatican library.

The literary treasures of Greece were brought to the West by such men as Theodore Gaza of Thessalonica, Chalcondyles of Athens, George of Trebizond, John Argyropulus, and Gemistius Pletho of Constantinople, all among the most distinguished scholars of that age.

It is to be regretted that Calixtus left a stain upon his otherwise unblemished reputation by creating two of his nephews cardinals on the same day, and a third, Duke of Spoleto and Governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, all of whom were worthless, especially *Rodrigo Borgia*, and possessed no merit entitling them to such honor. Neither were there wanting those who attributed the Pope's opposition to the succession of Ferdinand of Aragon to the crown of Naples, whose claims Eugene IV. had already acknowledged, to his desire to have the Duke of Spoleto succeed to that dignity.

The College of Cardinals went into conclave upon the death of Calixtus, but before proceeding to an election, they thought it obligatory upon them, in face of these abuses, to bind themselves severally by oath to the observance of such restrictions of the papal prerogatives, as would insure their correction. Their choice fell upon *Aeneas Sylvius*, the spirited historian of the Council of Basle, whose life is a striking illustration of the freaks of fortune, and the strange vicissitudes of human affairs. Born at Corsignano, whither his father had been exiled, and descended from the noble, but now reduced house of *Piccolomini* of Siena, he was unable to enter upon his studies until his eighteenth year. But gifted with a fine mind, he soon became distinguished for the elegance of his Latinity, the grace and spirit of his poetry, and the success with which he pursued his studies in jurisprudence. He next took a position as secretary under Capranica, Bishop of Fermo, one of the opponents of Pope Eugene, whom he accompanied to the Council of Basle, where he shortly made an able address opposing the transferrence of the Council to any other city. As a reward for this speech, he was promoted to the office of recorder of the Council. He was also frequently sent on important embassies, during some of which he was not over discreet in his conduct. He fell in with an Englishwoman at Strasburg, by whom he had a son—a fact which he quietly communicated to his father without any attempt at exculpation other than a reference to the examples of David and Solomon.[1]

---

[1] *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1375 sq. *A. Menzel*, Hist. of the Germans, Vol. VI., p. 241 sq., says: "That anything at all was done against the Turks is *wholly due to the exertions of the Pope*, and to him is to be given the credit of the *great battle of deliverance*, near Belgrade (July 22, 1456), gained by the efforts of his legates and crusaders," etc.

After the Council had been transferred he entered the service of Felix V., the antipope, as secretary, and during this time wrote his "*Commentarius de rebus Basileae gestis.*"

In the year 1442, he was sent on an embassy to the diet of Frankfort, and while there was crowned *poet laureate*, by the Emperor *Frederic III.*, under whom he took the position of secretary in the imperial chancery, and from this time forward entirely abandoned the cause of the antipope.

During his stay at Rome, whither he was sent by Frederic III., A. D. 1445, to urge the convocation of an ecumenical council, he received full pardon for his past opposition to the Holy See and was reconciled to Pope Eugene. He was now admitted to *priests' orders*, and proved a very efficient agent in adjusting the differences between the Pope and the Emperor.

Warned by a painful malady of the emptiness of all earthly ambition, he began to take a serious view of life. "The sum of all knowledge," said he, "is to know how to die, and, if one have not this, his past life, though in other respects without blame, has been to no purpose."

He was raised to the bishopric of *Trieste*, by Nicholas V., successor to Eugene; transferred to the see of *Siena*, and thence to that of *Ermeland*, and created *Cardinal* by Calixtus III. But before having entered upon his *duties* in the *last-named see*, he was called to fill the chair of Peter, and took the name of *Pius II.*[1]

---

[1] Ep. 15.

He displayed great energy and zeal in his attempts to rescue Europe from the yoke of the Turk. The better to inspire the faithful with the gravity of their danger and to stimulate them to noble exertions in averting it, he convoked an assembly of the European powers to be held at *Mantua*, A. D. 1459. But the result did not answer his expectations. Frederic III., who should have led the movement, was engaged in an attempt to seize the crown of Hungary, the very country that formed the bulwark of defense against the threatened invasions of the East, and Pius II. found at Mantua only a few Italian princes, and some embassadors from the transalpine courts. An instruction addressed by the Pope to the Sultan Mohammed, in the hope of persuading that prince of the truth of Christianity, was equally unsuccessful.

It is believed that Pius II. suggested to *Nicholas de Cusa* the idea of writing his work "*De Pace sive Concordantia Fidei*," the aim of which was to inspire the Mohammedans with a favorable idea of Christianity. "The time must come," says the pious author, in a burst of enthusiasm at the close of his work, "the time must come when the faith of Christ shall reign supreme, because He alone gives salvation, happiness, and life. Be thou, then, O Calif, converted to Him, and thy subjects will follow thy illustrious example."

Pius II., believing that if the princes of Europe beheld the Father and Teacher of Christendom, bowed with age and sinking under infirmity, leading the way at the head of an army against the Turks, they, too, roused to generous purpose by so inspiring a sight, would gallantly come forward in defense of the common cause, set out from Rome to Ancona, where the Venetian fleet awaited him.[1] But the fatigues of the journey, and the distress at seeing his efforts so poorly seconded, hastened his death, which occurred August 14, A. D. 1464.

---

[1] *Ant. Campani* Vita Pii II. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. II., p. 965.) Conf. also *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1389 sq. *Scharpff*, l. l., p. 268–305. On the efforts of Pius II. for the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, see *Schroeckh*, Ch. Hist., Pt. XXXII., p. 280–289. *Hagenbach*, Reminiscence of Aeneas Sylvius, Basle, 1840. *Voigt*, Enea Silvio as Pope Pius II., Berlin, 1856 sq., 3 vols, and in *Düx*, Nich. of Cusa, in many places. *Reumont*, Vol. III., 1, p. 129–152. *Gregorovius*, Vol. II., p. 156–210.

He was thus unfortunately prevented from carrying out those *general reforms* within the Church, which Nicholas de Cusa had pointed out with rare foresight and ability.

Pius II., like St. Augustine, withdrew, in his "*Bulla Retractationum*," the erroneous opinions which he had held on papal authority in the early part of his life, and which he had defended at the Council at Basle. "In my youth," said he, "I was led astray and in ignorance, and, like St. Paul of old, persecuted the Church of God and the Apostolic See. Some indeed may now say, 'Aeneas, who afterward became Pope, wrote thus and thus,' and may fancy that Pius II. and the Holy See now approve what Aeneas then wrote. *Let them*, therefore, *regard those early writings as of no consequence, and believe what Aeneas now teaches*, that the Pope, receiving the plenitude of authority over the whole Church immediately from Jesus Christ, confers all power possessed by the other members of the body ecclesiastic."

Owing to the long continuance of the schism, and the consequent tendency to circumscribe the authority of the Holy See, the practice of appealing from the decision of the Pope to the judgment of an ecumenical council had become common, and this abuse Pius II. determined to correct. In his bull "*Exsecrabilis*," he forbade all such appeals under pain of excommunication. It was found impossible to give to this bull the force of law in France, as the French parliament refused to allow Louis XI. to set aside the *Pragmatic Sanction* of Bourges.

Notwithstanding that the so-called capitulation oath, which *Paul II.*, the new Pope, a nephew of Eugene IV., had taken previously to his election, was one of unprecedented rigor, still, acting on the counsel of several eminent jurists, he resolved to entirely disregard the obligation under which it placed him. His love of display was so great, and his prodigality so excessive, that his legitimate revenue was found insufficient to meet his expenditures, and a tax was accordingly laid upon other churches, and the old abuses in the conferring of benefices again revived. He moreover laid himself open to the charge of nepotism, by raising three of his nephews to the dignity of the cardinalate.

---

[1] Cf. *Heinemann*, Aen. Sylv. as preacher of a crusade against the Turks, Bernburg, 1855.

On the other hand, Paul II., who, with admirable foresight, perceived that the excessive cultivation of Pagan literature and science, which was now becoming fashionable, if allowed to go on, would eventually be the source of great evil, set himself to resolutely oppose the tendency, which he characterized as a straying from the true faith. He also abolished the Court of Abbreviatori, on account of the notorious corruption which prevailed among its members. This court had been established by his predecessor, Pius II., and consisted of officers who prepared the bulls on the collation of benefices. Many of these were literary men and members of the academy that had been founded by the famous *Pomponio Leto*, a former pupil of Lorenzo Valla, for the revival of ancient classical literature, in the prosecution of which they went to the length of introducing Pagan rites and ceremonies. They were arrested, A. D. 1468, on suspicion of being implicated in a conspiracy against the Pope, and on a charge of apostasy from the faith; but, having been shortly afterward released, they again opened the academy. *Platina,* who had been among those put under arrest, took ample revenge on Paul for any wrongs he may have suffered, in a biography which he wrote of that pontiff, and to be found among his *Lives of the Popes.*[1]

Upon the death of Paul (A. D. 1471), a season of exceptional humiliation opened upon the papacy. It began with the pontificate of Cardinal Francesco della Rovere of Savona, formerly a professor of theology and general of the Franciscan Order, who ascended the papal throne August 25, A. D. 1471, under the name of *Sixtus IV.*

---

[1] *Pauli II.* Vita (by Cannese), praemissis ejus vindiciis adv. Platinam aliosque obtrectatores, ed. *Quirini,* Rom. 1740, 4to. *Caspar. Veronens.,* De gestis Pauli II. (*Muratori,* T. III., P. II., p. 1025.) Important documents for the history of the reign of Paul II. are: *Jacob. Piccolominei* Cardinal. Papiens. († 1479), rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarii libb. VII. (from 1464–1469), cum ejusd. epistol., Mediol. 1506 f.; *Gobellini* Comment., Frcf. 1614, p. 348 sq.

It is difficult to determine whether his vices or his virtues were more prominent. The former are chiefly to be ascribed to his desire of accomplishing great actions, and to his ambition to rule, for which he possessed eminent talents. He considerably enlarged the Vatican library, and appointed the learned *Platina* to the office of librarian; built, besides several other churches, those of Sta. Maria del Popolo and della Pace, and the *Sixtine Chapel*, which Ghirlandaio, Perugino, Michel Angelo, Rafaello, and others were engaged to fresco; adorned Rome with a number of magnificent public structures; placed Bonaventura on the catalogue of saints; was a munificent patron of literature; did all in his power to put an end to the controversies between the Thomists and the Scotists; and, immediately after his accession, invited all Christian princes to an *ecumenical council* to be held in the Lateran palace, where they might adjust their difficulties and part in peace. But these refused to obey his call.

On the other hand, he had scarcely entered upon the duties of his office when he raised two of his nephews, Pietro Riario and Rafaello Sansoni, to the rank of the cardinalate, and attempted to establish a principality in the Romagna for a third—Girolamo Riario—who had not entered the ecclesiastical state.

His political efforts were directed particularly against the *Florentines*, who had taken sides with Vitelli, Lord of Città di Castello, in his conflict with Sixtus; and against the Medici, who had refused to recognize Francesco dei Salviati as Archbishop of Pisa, to which see he had been appointed by the Pope.

Sixtus took revenge on his enemies for these acts of hostility by tendering the support of himself and his nephew Girolamo, to the house of Pazzi, now engaged in a conspiracy against that of the Medici, stipulating, however, that this should be attended with no bloodshed. Lorenzo dei Medici and his brother, Giuliano, were seized and condemned to death, but the former was fortunate enough to make his escape, and thus frustrated the designs of the conspirators. These latter, together with the Archbishop of Pisa, were at once put under arrest, condemned, and put to death. This act was followed by a bull, in which Sixtus, after enumerating the crimes of Lorenzo dei Medici and the other officers of the republic, declared them destitute of all sense of honor and justice, and their children incapacitated to enter upon the ecclesiastical state; and placed the dioceses of Florence, Fiesole, and Pistoja under interdict.

The Florentines paid little attention to the papal bull. Acting on the advice of some learned jurists, they appealed to a future ecumenical council; and, through the intervention of Louis XI. of France, who threatened Sixtus with a revival of the Pragmatic Sanction if he should persist in keeping the city under interdict, obtained a full release from the censures, A. D. 1480, but not till after they had expressed their sorrow for the execution of the ecclesiastics who had taken part in the conspiracy.

The terror, which the taking of Otranto by the Turks (August 11, 1480) had spread throughout all Italy, disposed the Pope to hasten to make peace with his enemies.[1] Sixtus was also engaged in quarrels with the *Venetians*, and in consequence, in the year 1483, passed sentence of excommunication upon the doge and the other magistrates of that republic. But they, too, like the Florentines, appealed from this sentence to a future council, commanded the ecclesiastics within their dominions to continue religious service as usual, and sent those who disobeyed it into exile.

These continual wars had exhausted the papal treasury, and the Pope, in order to replenish it, put ecclesiastical dignities on sale, and carried on a shameless traffic in taxes and other revenues, thus making the Roman court an object of universal contempt and execration.

His policy at home was equally unfortunate with that abroad. The two rival parties at Rome were represented by the house of the Orsini on the one side, and on the other by those of the Colonnas and Savelli, with the former of which the Pope and his nephew had taken sides. The arrest and imprisonment of two cardinals belonging to the two latter houses by the Pope's order, so incensed the Romans that they broke out into open revolt.

---

[1] His Life, written by *F. Onofrio Panvinio* (Tr.) (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. II., p. 1052); his theological treatises, Rome, 1470–71; Nor. 1473. *Reumont*, Vol. III., 1, p. 161–184. *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., p. 232–274.

Sixtus died August 12, A. D. 1484, in the seventy-second year of his age, and so generally detested was he that a contemporary writer said of him, on the day of his death: "To-day has God delivered His people from the power of this unjust man, who, destitute alike of the fear of God and the love of his fellow-men, sought only the gratification of his avarice and ambition."

Recourse was again had, for the third time, to the *capitulation oath*,[1] to prevent the repetition of so scandalous a pontificate. It would seem that the cardinals should have been taught by past experience that the restrictions of any such covenant, no matter with what circumstance and solemnity it might have been entered into, could, under specious pretexts, be easily set aside, and that the only effective way of providing a remedy adequate to the existing evils was to make choice of a man to fill the papal throne whose past life would be a guaranty for his future good conduct. After the usual promises had been given, the cardinals proceeded to an election, and their choice fell upon the decrepit old man, Cardinal John Baptist Cibo (*Κυβος*), a Genoese, who took the name of *Innocent VIII.* In his youth he had had a number of natural children, though, according to the account of *Ciacomo*, he was afterward married, and, on the death of his wife, entered the ecclesiastical state. He was appointed to the bishopric of Savona by Paul II., and by Sixtus IV. created domestic prelate and cardinal. While Pope, he managed to make comfortable provision for his two surviving children, Franceschetto and Theodorina, the latter of whom he gave in marriage to a Genoese, and for the former procured Maddalena the daughter of Lorenzo dei Medici.

Innocent, though a man of pacific disposition, and frequently allowing his love of peace to betray him into acts of weakness and indecision, found himself engaged in a war with Ferdinand of Aragon, King of Naples, which was not brought to a final close until the year 1492. The Pope, in need of some support in Italy, entered into an alliance with Lorenzo dei Medici, the man who had so bitterly opposed the preceding Pope, but whose son Giovanni, Innocent now created cardinal, notwithstanding that he was only a boy of thirteen, and had already been invested with twenty-nine ecclesiastical benefices.

---

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1484, nro. 28 sq. *Reumont*, Vol. III., 1, p. 187–198. *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., p. 275–308.

The affairs of the East early began to seriously engage the attention of Innocent. Following the example of his predecessors, he called upon Christian princes and peoples to undertake a fresh crusade against the Turks.[1] He also succeeded in bringing about a reconciliation between the rival houses of the Colonnas and the Orsini at Rome, thus putting an end to the disgraceful scenes consequent upon their rivalries, and for this office he received from the Romans the honorable title of the Father of his Country.

The Grand Master of the Knights of St. John had given Dshem, a younger brother and rival of *Bajazet II.*, into the custody of the Pope, who hoped that this prince might be of important service to the Christian cause in the contemplated Eastern war.

Bajazet II. paid the Pope annually forty thousand florins for keeping this prince in prison; and, though the transaction may, at first sight, be regarded as a venal service, a just appreciation of all the circumstances involved will lead the fair-minded reader to put quite a different estimate upon it. Innocent, like his predecessors, invented new means of extorting money from the churches to fill his depleted treasury. The decrees of Constance and Basle were either entirely forgotten or lost sight of; ecclesiastical affairs were esteemed of little consequence, and artists and savans seemed to have taken the place of ecclesiastics. This Pope, however, deserves considerable credit for his energetic efforts to suppress sorcery and withcraft and the remnants of the heresy of John Huss.[1] He died July 25, A. D. 1492.[2]

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1484, nro. 60 sq.; an. 1485, nro. 1 sq.; an. 1486, nro. 60 sq.; an. 1488, nro. 10 sq.

On the 11th of the following August, fifteen of the twenty-three cardinals who met in conclave, possessing a full knowledge of what they were about to do, and free from all external influence or constraint, if we except the money that was used to purchase their votes, chose Cardinal Roderigo Borgia, a Spaniard, to succeed to Innocent.[3] As Pope, he took the name of *Alexander VI.* He had already reached his sixty-first year. He was equally conspicuous for vices and virtues; was gifted with fine talents, and was a generous patron of the arts and sciences; was bold in conception, fearless in execution, and undaunted in the presence of danger; kind and affable to the poor and middle classes, harsh and arrogant to the rich and powerful; and, once he had made up his mind to accomplish a purpose, was unscrupulous as to the means to be employed.[4] After he had completed his studies he gained some distinction as an orator at the bar, but shortly gave up any ambition he may have entertained in this direction, to enter upon the more brilliant career of a military life. But when Calixtus III., his maternal uncle, became Pope, Roderigo was called to Rome, and having taken orders, was, in his twenty-fifth year, appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Valencia, and created Cardinal-deacon and Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church (A. D. 1456). Later on, Sixtus IV. created him Cardinal-bishop of Albano and Porto.

---

[1] Ibid. ad an. 1488, nro. 58.

[2] The following biographies of Innocent VIII. are extant: 1. By an anonymous contemporary, in the Diario di Roma dell' anno 1481–92, in *Muratori*, III. 2, p. 1070 sq.; 2. By *Infessura*, in the Diarium Romanae urbis, ibid., p. 1189 sq.; 3. By *Onuphrius Panvinius*, in the continuation of Platina; 4. By *Raphael Volaterranus*, in Geographia, lib. XXII., and by *James Volaterranus*, in the Diarium Rom. (1471–84), in *Muratori*, T. XXIII., p. 86 sq.; 5. By *Vilardi*, Vita d' Innocenzo VIII., Venez. 1613; and, 6. In *Pallatii* Gesta Rom. Pontif. III. 685 sq., in *Ciaconii* Vitae et Gesta Rom. Pontif. III. 89 sq.

[3] This venality is severely censured by *Raynaldus*, ad an. 1492: "Suffragia turpi sacrilegio vendidere Borgiae cardinales."

[4] *Burchardi* Diarium curiae Rom. sub. Alex. VI. 1484–1506 (*Eccardi* Corpus hist., T. II., p. 2017 sq. Less complete in the specimen hist. arcanae seu anecdota de vita Alex. VI., ed. *Leibnit.*, Han. 1696, 4to; more complete and enlarged in the ed. *Genarelli*, Flor. 1854 sq.) See below, p. 911, note 2. *Guicciardini*, l. c., lib. I.–VI. *Raphael Volaterranus*, in his Anthropologia, lib. XXII., thus characterizes this Pope: "In Alexandro, ut de Annibale Livius scribit, aequabant vitia *virtutes*. Inerat namque ingenium, ratio," etc. Against the representations, either wholly false or greatly exaggerated, of the suspected *Burchard*, and of *Pontanus*, *Sannazar*, *Giovio*, and *Guicciardini*, the first to protest was an Englishman, *Wm. Roscoe*, the eminent historian of Lorenzo de' Medici, in his second great work, "*The Life and Pontificate of Leo X.*," which first appeared in 1805, passed rapidly through several editions, and, like his former work, was translated into French and Italian, and into German by *Glaser*, Vienna, 1818, 3 pts. (see especially Pt. I., ch. 3–6.) Next came *Capefigue*, L'eglise pendant les quatre derniers siècles, T. I., p. 41–46; *Chantrel*, Le pape Alexandre VI., ed. II., Paris, 1864. These latter writers, however, were preceded by *Abbé Rohr-*

By contemporary writers, whose accounts are *sometimes conflicting*, he is represented as having carried on a secret intrigue with the noble Lady Vanozza de' Catanei, who had already been twice married, by whom he had four sons and one daughter. It is said that his relations with this lady were kept so secret that the knowledge of them was confined to a few, and that his grave demeanor, his simulated piety, and his profuse liberality made him popular with the people.

---

bacher, Hist. univ. de l'eglise catholique 2ème ed. Vol. XXII., p. 338–354; and the writer of the article Alexandre VI., in the *Dict. des papes* par *M. C. F. Chevé*, who says: "The more attentively and thoroughly the original documents of the history of that epoch are studied, the more clear will it become that the memory of Alexander VI. has been fearfully calumniated. To pass an unbiased judgment upon his life, it will be especially necessary to take into account his social surroundings. True criticism has long since cleared the name of Alexander VI. of the charges of poisoning and the other horrible crimes that had been groundlessly imputed to him by the revengeful journalists of the anteroom and the scandal-mongers of that age and country. The implacable hostility of the Reformers and the resentment of France because of the political attitude of Alexander VI. have also contributed not a little to blacken his memory. It is not our purpose to excuse the irregularities of his life, but we would invite the reader desirous of learning to what extent he has been defamed to peruse the chapter devoted to him by *M. Audin* (Hist. de Léon X., T. I., c. 2). He was charitable, energetic, fair-minded, and moderate. If he incurred so much ill-will, it is because he overcame and kept in check the feudal aristocracy of Rome." His life has been exhaustively written by *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., and by *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII. *Groene*, in his Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 294–316, has "*attempted*" to prove that *Juan de Borgia*, Duke of Gandia, and *Caesar* were his nephews, and *Lucrezia* his niece; but *Reumont* (Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 204), and *Gregorovius* (Vol. VII., p. 317), whose statements are derived from authentic sources, maintain that they were the natural children of Roderigo Borgia, and that the latter acknowledged them as such. Gregorovius, however, following the epitaph of *Vanozza* in the Church Sta. Maria del Popolo in Rome, states that Caesar Borgia was the *elder*, and Juan, Duke of Gandia, the *younger* son of Alexander.

Some of the cardinals, it is alleged, were deceived by these external evidences of sanctity, others were probably bribed, and both together placed Roderigo on the papal thrône. There is certainly some truth in these assertions; for when his election became known, the Roman people gave expression to their joy and intense worldly mindedness on the spur of the moment in an improvised address.[1]

The frivolity and questionable tone of morals which prevailed at the Papal Court after Alexander had become Pope, and which, if he did not openly encourage, he was at no great pains to correct, gave an opportunity to his many enemies to spread all sorts of scandalous stories, and to indulge in the most extravagant exaggerations. He did indeed greatly abuse his power to secure positions of profit and honor for his children.[2] He created his eldest son, *Juan*, Duke of Gandia, and fixed upon him many estates in the kingdom of Naples; he also bestowed upon him the Duchy of Benevento, which he had detached from the States of the Church.

In his endeavors to provide equally well for his two younger sons, *Caesar* and *Juffré*, and his daughter, *Lucrezia*, he had recourse to a policy at once dishonest and dishonorable. This was especially conspicuous in his conduct toward *Charles VIII.*, King of France, who came into Italy to defend the claims of the house of Anjou to the kingdom of Naples. Alexander, bribed by *Ferdinand*, King of Naples, espoused his cause, and after his death, which occurred January 25, A. D. 1494, was equally zealous in his advocacy of the rights of his son, *Alphonsus II.*

But when Charles VIII., entirely disregarding the excommunication that Alexander had published against him, entered Rome at the head of his army, on the last day of the year, the Pope hastened to make terms with the victor, and thus facilitated the conquest of Naples, which soon followed.

---

[1] Caesare magna fuit, nunc Roma est maxima. Sextus
Regnat Alexander. Ille vir, iste Deus!

[2] The mawkish sentimentality of Alexander in regard to his children was especially manifest when, in giving away his daughter Lucrezia for the last time in marriage, he said to the embassadors of the Duke of Ferrara, pointing to her donation of jewelry: "This is all for Lucrezia. It is my wish that she should possess finer pearls and a larger quantity of them than any princess of Italy." (*Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 239.) And, hearing of the death of his eldest son, Juan, he said: "Had I seven popedoms, I should gladly give them all for the life of my son." (*Gregorovius*, l. c., Vol. VII., p. 402 sq.) In a letter of recommendation to Louis XII., King of France, he called Caesar "the dearest object he had on earth." (*Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 228.)

In the following year Alexander concluded a fresh alliance with the Emperor of Germany and the King of Spain, the Doge of Venice, and Duke Sforza of Milan, for the expulsion of the French from Italy. Charles, unable to make head against this formidable coalition, withdrew in haste across the Alps.

By such dishonorable conduct Alexander set the example to the other princes of calling in foreign powers to settle the difficulties of Italy. The theocratic principle of the Popes of the Middle Ages was now superseded by a selfish policy and the lust of dominion.

Alexander and his infamous son *Caesar Borgia*, relieved of the presence of the French monarch, set about ridding the States of the Church of the independent vicars and petty tyrants by whom they were infested, reopened the courts of judicature, and restored commerce and industry. The boundless exactions of Caesar Borgia soon led to fresh complications and hostilities between Alexander and the new King of Naples, *Frederic*, the brother of Alphonsus II.

Those cardinals who had opposed the election of Alexander fled from his vengeance, and most of those who had sold their votes to him were arrested on suspicion of being his secret enemies, and were either murdered, imprisoned, or obliged to seek safety in flight.

On the death of his eldest son *Juan*, Duke of Gandia, whose murder the jealous Caesar Borgia is represented as having been instrumental in bringing about, Alexander showed some disposition to mend his ways, and even expressed an intention of resigning the papacy.[1] But this penitent state of mind gradually wore away as time and care rendered less distinct and horrid the terrible tragedy that had inspired it.

Caesar Borgia had entered the ecclesiastical state, and had been created cardinal, but now that his brother was dead,

---

[1] Cf. *Gregorovius*, l. c., Vol. VII., p. 402 sq.

Alexander dispensed him from any obligation his former condition imposed upon him, and transferred to him the titles and estates of Juan.

Louis XII. had ascended the throne of France in the year 1498, and in gratitude for a favor conferred upon him by Alexander, created Caesar Borgia, Duke of Valentinois, and gave him a French princess and a relative of his own in marriage. The Pope, feeling himself safe in so powerful an alliance, secured for his son the principality of the Romagna, of which he created him duke. He also subsequently gave large tracts of territory to the two sons of Lucrezia by her second husband, Alphonsus, who had been murdered by Caesar.[1]

Alexander has been accused of having lived in incest with his daughter Lucrezia,[2] who was thrice married. But this is a malicious fabrication. After she had withdrawn from the allurements of Roman society, whose evil influence did so much to corrupt her own and after ages, she devoted herself to a life of sincere piety and to works of Christian charity and mercy.[3] No less false is the slander of his having, in virtue of an alliance with the Sultan, caused the poisoning of the young Prince Dshem, who, as has been stated, had been given given into the custody of Innocent VIII. by the Knights of St. John. These outrageous charges are now generally regarded as atrocious calumnies. But as *Reumont* justly remarks, the fact that most scandalous reports should have been believed by members of his palace, is a strong argument against his innocence.

---

[1] *Gregorovius* VII., p. 156; *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 238.

[2] *Mr. Roscoe*, in his "Dissertation on the Character of Lucrezia Borgia," says: "With respect to the incestuous intercourse, of which she has been so generally accused, the circumstances of her life and conduct afford no evidence." Again, speaking of *Burkhard*, the papal master of ceremonies, the same author remarks: "It is highly important to our present subject to observe, that throughout the whole narrative of this loquacious master of papal ceremonies, who seems on no occasion to have *concealed* what *might disgrace* either his *superiors* or himself, there exists not the *most distant* intimation of that criminal intimacy between Alexander and his daughter, or between her and her brothers, which, if he had known or *suspected* it to have existed, it is not likely, from the tenor of other parts of his narrative, that he would have been inclined to wholly conceal." And speaking of those who celebrated Lucrezia's endowments of mind and beauty of person, Mr. Roscoe says: "If Lucrezia was guilty of the crimes of which she stands accused, the prostitution of her panegyrists is greater than her own;" but, he adds, "of such degradation several of the authors before cited were *incapable*." (Tr.)

[3] Cf. *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 206; concerning the poor work on Lucrezia by *Gilbert* (German by Regia, Lps. 1870), and the still more wretched lucubration of *Ollivier*, Le pape Alex. VI., Paris, 1870; conf. *Reumont*, in the *Bonn.* Review of Theol. Lit., year 1870, nros. 12 and 18.

The severe *censorship*[1] which Alexander exercised with regard to all publications, would seem to strengthen the suspicion that he had a dread of public opinion.

The great popular orator of Florence, *Jerome Savonarola*, of the order of Friars Preachers, came forth like another Elias, and hurled the thunders of his eloquence against the abuses of Alexander, and called upon the princes of Christendom to convoke an ecumenical council to depose him. An advocate of democratic principles, he alienated the affections of the people from their rulers, excited them to revolt, and finally himself fell a victim to the storm which he had evoked, but which he was powerless to check. After the Medici had been driven from Florence, Savonarola framed a constitution for the government of the city on the model of that of Venice. One of its articles provided that a person condemned to death for a political offense, should possess the right of appeal to the Great Council of the nation. Some conspirators under sentence of death claimed this privilege; Savonarola refused their petition, and they were executed. The city was in a wild state of excitement; the laity and secular priests took sides against the religious; the religious were equally defiant, and the pulpits rang with denunciations. Alexander VI., to whom the case had been referred, ordered the Dominican to leave off preaching till the difficulty should be settled, but this the latter obstinately refused to do. He was then brought to trial, found guilty of having published false prophecies, and of being a heretic, a schismatic, and the instigator of popular sedition. He was next handed over to the secular authority, condemned to death, and executed A. D. 1498.[1]

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad a. 1501. nr. 36: Inter multiplices nostrae sollicitudinis curas illam imprimis suscipere pro nostro pastorali officio debemus, ut quae salubria et laudabilia ac catholicae fidei consona et bonis moribus conformia nostro tempore oriuntur, non solum conserventur et augeantur, verum etiam ad posteros propagentur, et quae perniciosa, damnabilia et impia sunt, succidantur et radicitus exstirpentur, nec pullulare usquam sinantur, et in agro dominico et vinea Domini Sabaoth duntaxat conseri permittendo, quibus fidelium mentes pasci spiritualiter possint, eradicata zizania et oleastri sterililate succisa. Cf. *Fessler*, the ecclesiastical prohibition of books, Vienna, 1859.

Alexander, toward the close of his life, received a great fright from the falling of the ceiling of his room, an accident by which a number of those present with him at the time were killed and others wounded, and the effects of which, it is supposed, brought on the malignant tertiary fever, of which he died August 18, A. D. 1503.

The story of his having been poisoned at a banquet by a draught which his son had prepared for one of the cardinals, but which, by mistake, one of the servants waiting at the table, gave to his father, is entirely without foundation.[2]

It is certainly a little remarkable that Alexander, while making so flagrant a misuse of his pontifical power, never lost sight of the essential duties of the Head of the Church, and never compromised either faith or morals in any of the numerous official documents issued by him. As the great St. Leo remarked: "*The dignity of Peter is never entirely obscured, even in one unworthy of being his successor.*"

---

[1] *J. Fr. Pici*, Vita Hieron. Savon. (Batesii vit. sel. aliquot viror. Lond. 1681.) *Touron*, Hist. des hommes illustr. de l'Ordre de St. Domin., T. III., p. 571. In recent times Jerome Savonarola has been idealized and poetically transformed in essays and monographies by *Rudelbach*, Jerome Savonarola and his Age, Hamburg, 1835; B. *Meier*, Jerome Savonarola, mostly from manuscript sources, Berlin, 1836. Cf. the *Bonn Periodical*, nr. 27, p. 127–151. *Villari*, Hist. of Savonarola (Germ. by Berduscher, Lps. 1869).

[2] Thus *Roscoe*, in his Life of Leo X., according to *old* traditions (German by Glaser, Vienna ed., Vol. I., p. 352), and from modern investigations. Most of the denunciations, exaggerations, and fabrications against the character of Alexander VI. are to be met with in *Burkhard's Diarium*. He hailed from Strasburg, was master of ceremonies at the Roman court, Bishop of Città Castellana († in Rome, 1505), and was but poorly qualified to be a censor, since *Paris*, likewise master of ceremonies at the papal court, characterizes him in his Diarium ad an. 1506 as follows: "Non solum non humanus, sed supra omnes bestias bestialissimus, inhumanissimus, invidiosissimus." The text, moreover, of his *Diarium* has undergone very suspicious alterations. It was not until two hundred years after his death that *Leibniz*, from Latin, French, and Italian scraps, composed his work entitled "Specimen historiae, sive anecdota de vita Alexandri VI. Papae, seu excerpta ex *diario* Burchardi, edente *G. G. L(eibniz)*, Hannov. 1696, 4to. Then the same was published more fully, but with falsifications, by *Eccard*, in his *Corpus* hist. medii aevi, T. II. (cf. *Bréquigny's* Notices des msc. de la bibliothèque du roi, 1787, p. 74), and was still more enlarged, very recently, by *Gennarelli*, Burchardi Diarium Innoc. VIII., Alexander VI., Pii III. et Julii II., tempora complectens, Florent. 1854. Cf. *Gams*, in *Möhler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 522–523.

The most important political act of Alexander's pontificate was the suppression of those great aristocratic houses within the States of the Church, whose lords affected a sovereign independence of all government, and grievously oppressed the people. The Romans, knowing the character of the new Pope, anticipated that he would adopt this policy, and accordingly hailed his accession with joy, giving expression to their feelings in an inscription which celebrated his praises in fulsome words. They were soon undeceived, and they made ample amends for any excess of praise they may have bestowed upon him, by the acrimonious sarcasm with which they now assailed his character.[1]

§ 274. *Julius II.* (A. D. 1503–1513)—*Synod of Pisa—Fifth Council of Lateran—Leo X.* (A. D. 1513–1521.)

Paris de Grassis, Diarium curiae Rom. (1504–1522), in *Hoffmanni* Collectio nova script. et monum., T. I., and in *Raynald.*, Lettres du roi Louis XII., et du Card. d'Amboise, Brux. 1712, 4 vols. *Hadrianus Castellens.*, Itinerarium Julii. (*Ciaconii* Vitae Rom. Pontiff., Lugd. 1663, T. II.)

The Cardinals, conscious that the pontifical throne had been greatly dishonored by preceding popes, sought to restore its ancient glory by the election of a man worthy so great a dignity. This was Francis Piccolomini, a nephew of Pius II., whose name he took as Pope. He was a man of spotless character, possessed great business tact, and was earnestly desirous of restoring the discipline of the Church. But, unfortunately, he had scarcely intimated the noble purposes he had at heart, when he was carried away by death, after a reign of twenty-six days. To a man so full of promise to the Church succeeded one of a very different character. This was Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, a native of Abizal, near

---

[1] The Pope was subsequently compared to the tyrants Sextus Tarquinius and Sextus Nero, e. g. in the epigram:

"Sextus Tarquinius, Sextus Nero, Sextus et ipse;
Semper sub Sextis perdita Roma fuit."

Savona, and a nephew of Sixtus IV. Formerly a mariner, he was called by his uncle to ecclesiastical preferment. Created Cardinal of San Pietro in Vincoli, in 1471, he soon became distinguished for his exalted virtue, and particularly for the modesty which was conspicuous in whatever he said or did. Of grave, affable, and refined manners, he won the good-will of all, and his merits were the theme of every tongue. He had enjoyed the favor and confidence, not only of Sixtus IV., but also of Innocent VIII. Owing to an inveterate feud between his own house and that of Alexander VI., he went into voluntary exile in France on the accession of that Pontiff, where he remained ten years. When his hereditary enemy had passed away he was recalled from exile by the announcement that his thirty-seven colleagues assembled in conclave, had, by their unanimous vote, raised him to the papal throne, which he ascended under the name of *Julius II.*, to the great disgust and chagrin of Caesar Borgia. On receiving news of his election, he cried out, "O Lord, deliver us from the Barbarians." The energy and vigor of his character seemed to point him out as one well qualified to suppress internal revolt and repel foreign aggression. Had Julius lived in a different age, he would have been nearly, if not quite, as conspicuous for preëminence in the spiritual affairs of the Church, as he is now for his stern policy as a ruler. But because he defended, sword in hand, the States of the Church, driven to revolt by the oppression of the fugitive Duke of Valentinois, he appears to superficial observers, and has been frequently represented, as more intent upon indulging a passion for war than of providing for the well-being and advancement of the Church. Possessing in an eminent degree the talents of a warrior and the astuteness of a statesman, and determined to defend and extend, if possible, the Papal States, he was constantly occupied planning campaigns, and devising means for freeing Italy from foreign domination, a task to which he devoted the best energies of his life. Italian tyrants trembled before him, for they knew their hour was come.[1]

The warlike character of Julius formed so glaring a contrast to the pacific character of his office, that it furnished the wits of the age with a prolific subject for satire.[1] But apart from all this, it must be said to his honor that he was outspoken and honest in his dealings, inaccessible to corruption, and an enemy to *nepotism*, a generous steadfast friend, and a munificent patron of the arts and sciences. Carried away by his admiration for ancient Roman architecture, especially that grand style still visible in the baths of Dioclesian, he commenced the work of rebuilding upon a scale of unprecedented dimensions and splendor, the Basilica of St. Peter, which he had employed the celebrated *Bramante* to design. The Pope laid the corner-stone April 18, 1506, in presence of the cardinals and surrounded by a vast concourse of people; and to raise money for its construction, granted an indulgence to such as contributed to the work. One of the first acts of Julius after entering upon the duties of his office was to check the dangerous pretensions of Caesar Borgia, whom he deprived of the Duchy of Romagna, and sent into exile. The Duchy, together with the cities of Perugia and Bologna, was again annexed to the States of the Church. The despotic Baglionis were driven out from the former of these cities and from the latter the no less despotic Bentivoglios, after which their ancient liberties were restored by the Pope. Caesar Borgia, banished from Rome and all Italy, ventured to go by sea from Ostia to Naples. Here he was, by order of his Catholic Majesty, arrested and conveyed to the castle of Medina del Campo, in Spain, where he lay imprisoned for two years. At length he contrived to make good his escape, took service in the army of his brother-in-law, Jean d'Albret, King of Navarre, and finally lost his life, under the walls of the castle of Biano, March 12, 1507.[2]

---

[1] *Panvinio*, Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontefici. — Giulio II., Pont. CCXX., p. 257, Venice, 1594. (Tr.)

The Venetians had given grave offense to the Pope by taking possession of and holding the cities of Faenza and Rimini, and a tract of sea-board within his dominions. To humble them and effect a partition of their territory, Julius formed a coalition, in 1508, known as the *League of Cambrai*,[1] to which, besides himself, Maximilian of Germany, Louis XII. of France, and Ferdinand of Spain were parties. Spiritual as well as material weapons were employed by Julius to bring the Republic to terms. The Venetians, seeing that it was useless to contend against so formidable a coalition, complied with the demands of the Pope, and were absolved from ecclesiastical censures.

---

[1] *Julius exclusus*, by Hutten, or Erasmus (Pasquill. T. II., Eleutheropoli—i. e., Basil. 1544, p. 423 sq.)

[2] *Audin*, Biograph. Univ., T. 5. (Tr.)

Julius next turned the power of his arms against his vassal, Alphonsus of Este, Duke of Ferrara, who had contested with the Holy See the right of suzerainty over the States of Italy, and entered into an alliance with Louis XII., of whose political influence on the peninsula Julius was becoming apprehensive. The Duke of Ferrara was banished the country. This conduct greatly irritated Louis, who, at the instance of certain cardinals, resolved, while Julius was at the head of his army in Italy, to employ *spiritual weapons* against the latter.

The prelates, and the deputies and chapters of universities within the kingdom of France, met at Orleans, August, A. D. 1510, whence they went to Tours, and while there, gave it as their opinion to Louis, that the Pope had no sort of right to make war on foreign princes, and that, should he do so, these were at liberty to withhold their obedience from him, and to utterly disregard his censures. They also represented that the present Pope was particularly at fault since, instead of giving his attention to the business of an ecumenical council, which he had pledged himself by oath in conclave to convoke before the expiration of two years, he was engaged in carrying on war.

Maximilian entered warmly into Louis' project of holding a council *independently of the Pope*, and published a manifesto, in which he declared that should the latter refuse to convoke it, he would appeal to the cardinals. Some of the latter were found pliant enough to give their support to the schismatical design of these princes, and appointed *Pisa* as the place of meeting for the proposed council (November 5, A. D. 1511).

---

[1] *Dubos*, Hist. de la ligue faite à Cambrai, La Haye, 1710, 2 T.

Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence, imprudently extended the hospitality of the city to the rebellious cardinals.

The members of this robber-council protested in advance against any censures the Pope might pass upon them.[1] The conventicle, which was composed chiefly of Frenchmen, and was but a very indifferent copy of the Council of Basle, went to the length of suspending the Pope, who was styled "*another Goliath.*"

Julius II. defended himself against the charges of which he had been accused, by representing that the troubled condition of Europe, and particularly of Italy, rendered it impossible for him to convoke the council as he had promised, much as he might desire to do so.

In the year 1512, he entered into a fresh coalition with Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain and Naples, and Henry VIII. of England, and with Switzerland, which forced the French to retire from Italy. Deprived of the protection of French arms, and regarded with suspicion by the Florentines, of whose territory Pisa then formed a part, the prelates withdrew to Milan, then a mere French fortress, thence to Asti, and finally to Lyons. Julius now laid all France, with the exception of Bretagne, under interdict.

The *Eighteenth Ecumenical or fifth Council of Lateran*, which the Pope had in the meantime convoked, convened May 10, A. D. 1512. At the opening session there were present fifteen cardinals and seventy-nine bishops, but this number was soon increased to one hundred and twenty, the majority of whom were Italians.[2]

Giles of Viterbo, the General of the Augustinians, delivered the opening address, in which he drew a vivid picture of the evils that distracted and afflicted the Church.[3] "Julius II.," said he, "*is indeed the first pontiff who has successfully employed*

---

[1] Acta concilii Pisani, Par. 1612, 4to, as conciliabulum Pisanum, in *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1559 sq. Conf. *Richerii* Hist. concilior., lib. IV., c. 2, 3.

[2] Acta Conc. Lateran. V. oecumen., in *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1561–1856.

[3] Conf. *Harduin*, l. c., p. 1576 sq., where it is said, among other things: "Ad haec vero agenda cum alia permulta, tum praecipue exercitus amissus excitare nos debet: quod equidem putem divina providentia factum, quo armis ecclesiae alienis freti cederemus, ut ad nostra redeuntes victores evaderemus. Nostra autem arma sunt pietas, religio, probitas, supplicationes, vota, lorica fidei atque

the arms of secular warfare in defense of the Church. But for all this, it is not in such weapons the Church puts her trust. She can never count certainly on success, until her bishops, assembled in council, make use of those weapons of which the Apostle speaks, and with which she is to go forth and achieve that victory to which the Catholic world is now hopefully looking forward. If the Church is great, she has become so through victories gained in spiritual warfare, An extension of territory is of no great importance to her; her spiritual wealth is her all."

This Council, which was recognized by the Emperor Maximilian, through his representative, *Matthew Lang*, Bishop of Gurk, who arrived during the third session, employed its first five sessions in reviewing and condemning the decrees of the conventicle of Pisa. The Fathers were proceeding to consider the case of France, where there had been a movement on foot to set up an antipope in the person of the abbot of Clugny, and a disposition to frighten the Holy See by holding the Pragmatic Sanction over him *in terrorem*, when Julius II. died, February 22, A. D. 1513, still meditating great reforms.

"History," says *Audin*, "presents no example of a man destined to wear a crown who possessed in a higher degree all the qualities of a great ruler. Equally unsearchable to all who approached him, he was still a stranger to dissimulation; bold in his designs, but never rash in his execution; quick to resolve, but correct in his calculations. He was patient in adversity, fearless in danger, merciful in the hour of victory."[1]

"That an old Pope," says *Rohrbacher*, "rarely free from sickness, should undertake to beat simultaneously both the King of France and the Emperor of Germany, for the purpose of teaching them that he was master in his own house, is indeed a little surprising; but not more so than to see Frenchmen and Germans, in works of biography and history, represent this act of self-defense as a scandalous abuse of power, probably because he defeated them instead of being defeated by them."[2] "He can not," says *Panvinio*, "be

---

arma lucis, ut Apostoli verbis utar. Ad quae si Synodi opera redibimus, ut armis non nostris inferiores aliquo hoste fuimus, ita nostris erimus omni hoste superiores."

[1] *Audin*, Histoire de Léon X., T. I., p. 257, 12mo. (Tr.)

[2] *Rohrbacher*, Hist. Univ. de l'Église, Vol. 22, p. 375 sq. (Tr.)

too much praised for having so courageously and perseveringly exerted himself to preserve and extend the States of the Church; although there be some who, believing him to have been more given to the profession of arms than was compatible with his state, are inclined to give him scant credit."[1] "The character of Julius," says *Kraus*, "though vehement and sometimes carrying him beyond the limits of moderation, was one of incomparable grandeur. He well deserved the most magnificent sepulchral monument of the prince of artists."[2]

When we reflect on the political and warlike character of this Pope, it need scarcely excite surprise in us to be told that the Emperor Maximilian, who had now become a widower, entertained designs of securing the papacy for himself,[3] with the intention probably of combining the papal and the imperial dignity in one person. In this he was unsuccessful. The fifty cardinals, who went into conclave, elected the young Cardinal-deacon, Giovanni dei Medici, now in the thirty-eighth year of his age, who, on ascending the papal throne, March 19, A. D. 1513, took the name of *Leo X.* He had been ordained priest on the 15th of the same month, and consecrated bishop on the 17th. Leo was a true representative of his age. An ardent admirer of classic and humane culture, he possessed a refined taste, had a love of elegant literature, and was sincerely devoted to the arts and sciences. But, for all this, he was entirely destitute of the motives and spirit which should form the guiding principles in the life of an ecclesiastic, and was, moreover, lavishly extravagant.

The first exercise of his authority was to found a college for the publication of the Greek authors, under the superintendence of the celebrated *Lascaris.* The Vatican became the resort of savans, literati, and artists.[4] *Bembo* and *Sadolet*, distinguished for the purity and elegance of their Latinity, were at once created cardinals and appointed his secretaries; *Bramante* and the great universal genius, *Michael Angelo*, were at work upon St. Peter's, and *Raphael*, surnamed "*The Divine*," was engaged in decorating the loggie and the stanze. The work of the Lateran Council, which Louis of France now acknowledged, was again taken up where it had been left off in the *fifth* session, on the death of Julius II.

---

[1] *Panvinio*, Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontefici, Giulio II., p. 260. (Tr.)

[2] Michael Angelo's statue of Moses in the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli, *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 436. (Tr.)

[3] The correctness of the rumor is proven by *Aschbach* (*Dieringer's* Cath. Jour. 1845). It was probably the conduct of some of the popes that inspired *Guignecourt* to say that the Church would get on quite as well without them. See the letter of the University of Paris to the antipope Clement VII., 1394. *Albert Jäger*, Relation of Emperor Maximilian to the Papacy, Vienna, 1854.

[4] Cf. *Audin*, Life of Pope Leo X. (transl. from the Fr. into. Germ. by Burg, Augsburg, 1845, 2 vols.; into English by Turnbull, and also by Bishop McGill.

The old question of reform was again discussed and decrees proposed which provided for a purer morality and a stricter discipline; proscribed the excessive study of the Pagan classics and the absurd doctrine that the world possessed a soul; denied that there existed an antagonism between philosophical and theological truths, and abolished the practice of the same person holding several ecclesiastical benefices, the possession of which would require incompatible duties; condemned the concubinage of the clergy and the employment of interdicts for trivial causes, and recommended the erection of *Montes Pietatis*, or establishments where the poor might obtain small loans at a trifling percentage, this being limited, by act of government, to what was barely necessary to defray expenses.

These salutary measures were received with indifference. The evil had grown to such vast dimensions that the men of that age lacked the nerve, the vigor, and the determination to look it steadily in the face, to grapple with it, and to persevere in the struggle till it should have been crushed, or at least rendered harmless. And, of all the men of his time, *Leo* was perhaps least fitted, either by nature or education, to undertake and conduct to a successful issue so difficult a task.[1] He was far more intent on having the Pragmatic Sanction abolished, and in this he succeeded in a private interview he had with Francis I. at Bologna, in 1515. A *concordat* regulating the affairs of the French Church was drawn up by the two parties and confirmed by the Council of Lateran,[1] but rejected by the French Parliament, which charged the King with abusing his authority because he firmly insisted on its acceptance.[2] With this, Leo fancied that the object of the Council had been completely attained, and seemed either totally oblivious of, or entirely disregarded the decay that had come upon every branch of ecclesiastical discipline, and which, while it was eating into and poisoning the very life of the Church, was no uncertain token of the sad days that were soon to follow. Leo, after having made provision that the tithes of all benefices should, during the succeeding three years, be paid into the papal treasury for the purpose of defraying the expenses of a war against the Turks, dismissed the prelates at the close of the twelfth session, March 16, A. D. 1517.[3]

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1513, nro. 97, relates the following incident: "When Leo X. was informed that almost the half of the prelates were demanding a reform of the whole body ecclesiastic in its head members, papa *quasi subridens* dixit, velle aliquantulum cogitare, ut omnibus satisfiat, et sic in prima sessione futura deliberare, quod omnium reformatio fiat, tam sui quam *reformatorum!*"

Thomas de Vio da Gaëta (Cajetanus), the General of the Dominican Order, had besought the Pope, as he valued the welfare of the Church, not to close the Council; but his foresight was not appreciated, nor were his words of warning heeded. The deplorable state of the Church at this time caused *Gailer of Kaisersberg* to utter these prophetic words: "*Since neither the Pope, the Emperor, the King, nor the Bishops will undertake the work of reform, God will presently send one who will.*"

§ 275. *Review of the Situation of the Papacy.*

The one great object that occupied the minds and engaged the energies of all during this controversy, was to define both in theory and practical working the exact limits of papal authority, to restore it to its primitive and *normal* condition. Two very different and diametrically opposite ways were pursued to reach this end—the one led straight to a *centralization* of all power *in* the hands of *the episcopacy;* the other, scarcely less direct, to an attempt to erect *the papacy* into an absolute monarchy. The advocates of the former theory were the Fathers of the Councils of Constance and Basle, and preëminently the celebrated theologians, *Henry of Langenstein* (de Hassia), *Gerson*, *Peter d'Ailly*, *Nicholas de Cusa*, *Nicholas de Clemange*, and others. These maintained that the temporal power was wholly independent of the spiritual authority; that *ecumenical councils* were possessed of supreme legislative authority, including within its range even the Pope himself, who, they said, is indeed the *administrative* (*caput ministeriale ecclesiae*), but not the *constituent* Head of the Church; and, that, since his authority is dependent upon that of the episcopacy, it is lawful to appeal from his decision to the judgment of a council. "All bishops," said Nicholas de Cusa, "have their power immediately from God; and, hence, questions of rank and priority relate entirely to the exercise of this power, and must be settled by established rules, which are, on this very account, subsidiary to, and not of the essence of, the power itself. Christ, in addressing Peter, spoke to all the other apostles as well, and committed to him no special grant of power.[1] The Pope is, therefore, only *the first among equals* (*primus inter pares*)."

---

[1] Textus integer Concordator. inter Leon. X. et Franc. I. (*Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1867–1890.)

[2] Relation de ce qui se passa sur la publication et l'enseignement du Concordat au Parlement de Paris. *Münch's* Collection of all Concordats, Pt. I., p. 225, and *Richerti* Histor. Conc., lib. IV., P. II., c. 4, nr. 13.

[3] *Roscoe*, Life and Pontificate of Leo X., Liverpool, 1804, 4 vols. 4to; London, 1806, 6 vols.; transl. into Italian: Vita e Pontificato di Leone X., etc. (free compilation), Milano, 1816, 12 vols.; Germ. by *Glaser*, with annotations by *Henke*, Lps. 1806 sq., 3 vols.; Vienna, 1818. *Fabroni*, Vita Leon. X., Pisis, 1797, 4to. *Ranke*, The Popes of Rome, their Church and State during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Berlin, 1834 sq., Vol. I., p. 71 sq., p. 80–90 of ed. 2.

These erroneous opinions were the underlying principles of a complete system whose aim and scope centered in the one purpose of degrading the authority of the Holy See, and of unduly restricting the rights and prerogatives which had been freely accorded to it during the lapse of a long course of ages. To make matters worse, secular princes strengthened the hands of these unworthy ecclesiastics, and busied themselves in throwing fresh difficulties in the way of a settlement.

To defend this *theory of episcopal authority* a pretense was made of an appeal to history, but only incidentally and with partisan dishonesty. Thus, Nicholas de Cusa[1] proved the Decretals of Isidore Mercator to be spurious, and *Laurentius Valla* showed that the so-called Donation of Constantine was a forgery, as if either, or both, whether genuine or otherwise, would in the least affect papal authority.

---

[1] *Nic. Cusan.*, De concord. cath., lib. II., c. 4–13.

On the other hand, the Popes showed no disposition either to contract the limits of their spiritual authority, or to relinquish any part of that supreme power which they had acquired. Their defenders, among whom were *Turrecremata*, *Thomas of Sarzano*, and others equally distinguished, also appealed to history, where they had certainly the advantage of their adversaries, and contended that the spiritual authority was necessarily above the secular; that the Pope was the source of all episcopal jurisdiction, and superior to an ecumenical council.

Toward the close of this period the Dominican, *Thomas de Vio of Gaëta* (Cajetanus), and *James Almain*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, were the two most prominent advocates of these two schools of opinion.[2] It is unfortunate that the disputants, in the heat of controversy, should have lost sight of the only practicable way of adjusting the difficulty. Had they taken the pains to read history aright they would have learned, first, that without the centralized power of the papacy the Church could never have come safe through the disorders and anarchy of the Middle Ages, and next, that the schism could not have been closed except by the application of the principles advanced by the advocates of episcopal rights. The line of procedure had been clearly traced out by *Nicholas V.* in an address made by him to the embassadors of the electoral princes, sent to Rome to congratulate him on his election to the papacy. "It is indeed true," said he, "that the Popes have so far extended their authority beyond just limits, that they have finally absorbed that of the bishops;

---

[1] Ibid., lib. II., c. 34; lib. III., c. 2 and 3. Concerning *Laurentius Valla*, see Vol. I., p. 42, note 2, and Fascicul. rer. expetendarum, etc., fol. 64–80, ed. Colon. 1535.

[2] *Cajetani* Tractat. de comparatione auctoritatis Papae et Conc. (*Rocaberti* Bibl. max. Pontificia, T. XIX.) *Jac. Almaini* Tract. de auctor. eccl. et Concilior. gener. (*Gersonii* Opp., ed *du Pin*, T. II., p. 976.)

and the natural result of such a policy has been, that the Fathers of Basle have gone to the other extreme, and attempted to unduly restrict the authority of the Pope. When one sets out with conduct unworthy of himself and unbecoming his office, he must expect to be eventually the victim of injustice; just as a tree that is inclined too much to one side is in the righting often dragged too much to the other. For my own part, I have firmly purposed not to invade the legitimate rights of bishops, and a share in the government of the Church is certainly a prerogative of their office. *There is but one way to preserve inviolate the authority of the Pope, and that is to respect, to the full, the authority of every other member of the hierarchy.*"[1]

These *councils*, assembled for the purpose of providing measures of reform, lost sight of their avowed object in endless debates on papal supremacy. They seemed determined to bring this question to an issue, and to decide it one way or the other. Its discussion consumed the time that should have been given to reform, and this, by being indefinitely deferred, was more completely ignored than if it had never been taken up. Neither could much encouragement be expected from *Popes* who could not be unconscious that every adequate measure of reform would bear heavily on themselves. Moreover, the protracted sojourn of the Popes at Avignon, the Western Schism, the scandalous events consequent upon it, and the reprehensible conduct of many of the Popes, had given so violent a shock to the authority of the Holy See, that its decrees were no longer received with respect and obedience by the Catholic world.

Again, the unity of the Church was threatened by the action of the various governments which attempted, by concordats and pragmatic sanctions, such as those of Bourges, Frankfort, and Mentz, to establish national churches.

Notwithstanding all the evils that came upon religion in this age, and in spite of every effort that had been made to obscure, and, if possible, to obliterate the very idea of the papacy, this nevertheless retained its hold all the same on the great bulk of the people, and was regarded as the underlying principle of Catholic unity, and the essential condition to the government of the Church. "The voice of the Pope," says *Schröckh*, "was obeyed with as much alacrity at the opening of the sixteenth century, as it was under Boniface VIII. at the close of the thirteenth." So singular a phenomenon can be adequately accounted for on no other theory than by attributing it to that abiding assistance which God has promised to His Church, and which, in spite of all the abuses human frailty and wickedness may bring upon her, preserves inviolate her divine and *essential* element and keeps it aglow in the hearts of the faithful.

---

[1] In *Koch*, Sanctio pragm. Germ. illustr., cap. 2, § 15.

It was indeed a beautiful and truly Christian idea, to so adjust the relations of the Papacy and the Empire, that they should work harmoniously together, and pursue, each in its own way, a common line of action; and this spirit of agreement, though gradually growing less cordial, was yet, on some solemn occasions, sufficiently prominent. As Henry II. had on one occasion read the Gospel at the Papal Mass at Fulda, so also did Sigismund, in the present age, serve as deacon at a Mass celebrated by John XXIII. at Constance; and Charles IV., when entering Rome, led the horse of Urban V. by the bridle, and later on, requested Gregory XI. to give the papal sanction to the appointment of his son, Wenceslaus, as King of Rome. But at the close of this period Maximilian inaugurated a new era by assuming, at Trent, in the year 1508, the title of Emperor elect *of Rome*, without having received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope.

§ 276. *Review of the Condition of the Other Members of the Hierarchy.*

The labors of these councils, convened, as has been said, for the avowed purpose of providing measures of reform, were chiefly taken up in attempts to render the *bishops* more independent of the Holy See, and to secure for them that measure of authority which they had enjoyed in the primitive Church. But the bulk of the bishops, conscious that any abridgment of papal authority would result in a degradation of their own, and subject their estates to the authority of temporal princes, refused the extraordinary prerogatives with which the councils were ready to invest them.

The inferior clergy had also ample reason to complain, in France, of the serious grievances which they were forced to suffer in consequence of the encroachments of the secular magistrates on their rights and privileges, and of the independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised over them by the bishops of Germany. The condition of both laity and clergy was rendered still more intolerable by the *burdensome direct and indirect taxes* levied by the Court of Rome, and by its practice of *conferring benefices chiefly upon foreigners*, relatives, cardinals, and favorites, who, far from being the best qualified, seemed altogether unfit to take charge of souls.

The clergy of Germany complained most bitterly of these practices. "The Court of Rome," says *Meyer*, the chancellor of the elector of Mentz, "has devised a thousand contrivances for extorting money from us, as if we were barbarians."

The plea for the See of Rome, written by *Aenéas Sylvius*,[1] was coldly received, and called forth from James Wimpheling, a priest of Spire (A. D. 1510), a brief and cutting reply. Still, things went on in the old way; the bishops continued to take the usual oath of fidelity to the Pope, and while consenting to pay, besides the pallium tax, an additional one for the privilege of retaining their bishoprics, indemnified themselves by extorting money for the collation of benefices, alleging in excuse of the practice, that as they themselves had not received, so neither could they confer, offices and dignities gratuitously.

The bishops also contrived to obtain control of a great number of benefices, and the cardinals did the same whenever they were fortunate enough to secure the favor of some Pope. The *chapters* refused to admit among their number any but nobles, notwithstanding the severe regulations that Gregory IX. had made for the correction of this abuse.[2] This, with many other similar abuses, was sharply censured by the Council of Constance, for the reason that, if the practice were allowed to go on, the chapters would eventually contain only men destitute alike of żeal and learning, and who, on becoming bishops, would work the ruin of the Church. The Council, therefore, directed that for the future one-fourth of canons composing each chapter should be selected from among the lower walks of life, and that these should be doctors either of theology or of laws, or, at least, have gone through a thorough course of studies and taken their academic degrees.[1]

---

[1] Descriptio de ritu, situ, moribus et conditione Germaniae, in Aenae Sylv. Opp., and in *Bzovii* Annal. eccles., T. XVII., p. 186 sq.

[2] See § 230, p. 646, note 4. Cf. *Höfler*, Rupert of the Palatinate, Freiburg, 1861, p. 113. The contradictory conduct of influential ecclesiastics in this matter was curiously illustrated at Basle, where none but nobles were admitted into the chapters, while at Augsburg all but commoners were excluded.

The bishops, wholly disregarding the authority of the Holy See of which they had once stood in so much awe, but which had now fallen so low that they might set it at defiance with impunity, shamefully neglected the care of their flocks; but beyond this, there was no change in the mode of administering dioceses. Numbers of the bishops were absent from their sees during the residence of the Popes at Avignon, and alleged the example of the latter in extenuation of their own conduct. One of these, whom Gregory XI. reproved for absence and neglect of duty, promptly replied: "But do you show me the example by returning to Rome." Still the Councils passed rigorous decrees enjoining the duty of residence.[2]

§ 277. *Morals of the Clergy.*

The gradual decline of papal influence and the evil example of the lives of some of the Popes reacted with terrible effect upon the morals of the bishops. As many of these had secured their sees by the employment of questionable means, it need excite no surprise if, having once entered upon the duties of their office, they led lives the reverse of exemplary, and did absolutely nothing to elevate the standard of morality among the faithful. The following description, drawn by *Vincent Ferrer*, of the bishops of his day, will certainly not fall in with our idea of a model prelate: "They are vain and arrogant courtiers, lovers of fine living and pompous display, and much given to usury; they make their faith subservient to schemes of worldly wealth and ambition, and entirely neglect the care of their churches; they visit the great ones of the world and the wealthy, but seldom the poor and the lowly; they have neither simplicity, love of God, nor chastity, and the celebration of Holy Mass and the preaching of the Word of God have ceased to be objects of their solicitude; in short, their entire life is one uninterrupted scandal." This is certainly a frightful picture, and one which, if at all applicable to the bulk of the episcopacy, would undoubtedly argue a terrible dissoluteness of morals; this, however, is by no means the case, as is evident from the great number of those bishops whose constant cry at ecumenical councils, was for a "*reformation of the Church in her Head and members.*"

---

[1] Apud *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. X., Reformatorium in Conc. Constant., c. 34: In qualibet ecclesia cathedrali sit *una praebenda pro magistro in Theologia*, qui saltem bis in septimana legat et aliquando praedicet, et *una pro doctore juris Canonici vel civilis*, qui in causis ecclesiae patrocinari teneatur. — De aliis vero praebendis *quarta pars graduatis debeatur in Theologia jure canonico vel civili*, cap. 35. To put a stop to the abuse of selecting only nobles for canonries, it is said: "*Gradus* etiam *doctoratus* vel *licentiatus in sacra pagina, jure canonico vel civili pro quacunque nobilitate reputentur*," p. 638 sq. The same dispositions are repeated, but more energetically, p. 695, lib. III., titul. III., De praebendis et dignitatibus.

[2] Reform. Const. Conc. decret., lib. III., titul. II.: De clericis non residentibus in eccl. vel praebenda (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. XII., p. 694).

But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that morality, especially among the lower clergy and in the monasteries, was dissolute indeed in the fifteenth century. Were other evidence of this assertion wanting, the fact that extraordinary papal visitors, such as *Nicholas de Cusa*, *John Busch*, and *Paulus*,[1] were sent out to investigate into the state of affairs, and that the councils of the time found it necessary to provide special legislation to meet the evil, would be sufficient to substantiate it. Concubinage was the crying vice among the clergy of many dioceses.

It is true that such pictures, as that given above, are often greatly exaggerated, and, as a rule, are stricken off in a moment of indignant horror, when the information of some scandal is borne in with crushing effect upon the soul of one who is sensitive of the honor of the Church and the good name of the clergy. Such scandals will occur in the very best and purest ages, and can not be assumed as fairly representing even the worst and most dissolute. Neither can the action of synods be taken as conclusive against the morals of any age; for never yet did a synod convene, which did not complain, in a temper more or less disheartening, of the degeneracy of morals, and manifest an anxious solicitude for their improvement.

---

[1] Cf. the Reformatorium in concil. Constant., cap. 33, contra concubinarios. (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. X., p. 635.) *Concil. Basil.*, sess. XX., decret. I: De concubinariis. (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1193; *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 101.) *Düx*, Nichol. de Cusa, Pt. II., p. 12–75.

But after allowance has been made for every such modifying circumstance, the fact that during this age the morality of the clergy was deplorable, is still before us in all its hideous deformity.

This dissoluteness of morals rapidly infected the laity, who learned from those whose lives should have been examples of manly honesty and priestly honor, to put a light estimate on the virtue of purity.[1] The leading minds of the councils were divided as to what means to employ for removing so deep a stain from the priestly character. Some professed to believe that the marriage of the clergy was the only adequate remedy for the evil; but others, more far-seeing and of wider range of thought, such as *Gerson*,[2] protested against the suggestion, and maintained that the well-being of the Church depended upon the rule of celibacy, the observance of which would be rendered morally certain if based upon a thoroughly clerical education, an education such as is consonant with a divine calling to the priesthood. Decrees were enacted punishing with fines and deposition those of the clergy who should refuse to leave off living in concubinage.[3]

---

[1] The Council of Paris, 1429, complained of the bad example set by clerics (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1406; *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1107), and adds: "Illud nefandissimum scelus (concubinatus) in ecclesia Dei adeo invaluit, ut jam non credant Christiani, simplicem fornicationem esse peccatum mortale."

[2] *Gerson* wrote against Saignet his Dialogus sophiae et naturae super coelibatu ecclesiasticor. (Opp., T. II., p. 617 sq.) Cf. *Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 696–704.

[3] Such decrees were issued by the Council of Presburg (Posonia), A. D. 1309, can. 5; the Council of Basle, Sess. XX., see above, p. 929, n. 1; a synod of Breslau, held between 1447 and 1456 (*Harzheim*, Conc. Germ., T. V., p. 445, De cohabi-

As these disorders were very generally believed to be a consequence of the great wealth of the clergy, many asserted that the removal of so potent an occasion of sin, was the first step toward either forming a new clergy, with more exalted principles of priestly purity and honor, or raising up those of the existing clergy from the depth of degradation to which their avarice and their immorality had precipitated them, and establishing them once more in the esteem and affections of a laity who now regarded them with aversion and contempt.

§ 278. *Negotiations with the Greek Church for a restoration of Union — Seventeenth Ecumenical Council at Ferrara and Florence.*

Hefele, The Temporary Reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church, two articles (in the Tübg. Quart. of Theol. 1847). *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism between the Church of the East and the West, Vol. I., p. 383. *Zhishmann*, Treaties of union between the Oriental and Roman Churches, from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the Council of Ferrara (exclusively), Vienna, 1858. *Frommann*, Critical Supplements toward a History of the Church Union of Florence, Halle, 1872.

After the restoration of the Greek and Latin Churches to unity, effected after so many sacrifices and with the very best motives, at the Fourteenth Ecumenical Council, held at Lyons (1274), had been rejected by the fanatical Greeks, owing chiefly to the imbecility of the reigning dynasty, many other similar but less imposing attempts were made to bring about the same object, but with little, if any success. When the Turks, who had already gained possession of Adrianople, were seriously menacing Constantinople, another effort at reconciliation was made by *John VIII., Palaeologus*, who came to Rome to confer personally with the Pope, while *Nicholas de Cusa* was pushing forward the same good work at Constantinople. The *schismatical Council of Basle*, after its fashion, interfered to complicate matters between the Pope and the Emperor, and even sent a fleet to convey the latter and the bishops accompanying him to the shores of Italy. But in

---

tatione clericorum et mulierum). The Council of Paris, 1429, can. 23, forbade the infliction of such fines (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1045; *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1108).

the meantime the Greek Emperor, *Joseph, Patriarch* of Constantinople, and seven hundred Greeks embarked on board the fleet placed at their disposal by Eugene IV., and after a voyage of seventy-seven days, arrived at the harbor of Venice, whence they proceeded to *Ferrara.* One hundred and sixty Western bishops, some of whom were from Basle, but mostly from other quarters, had already assembled in this city at the call of Eugene, and on January 8, 1438, continued the sessions of the dissolved Council of Basle. The Pope made his appearance at Ferrara during the second session, February 15th, and published a decree summoning the Fathers of Basle to dissolve their assembly within forty days. This they refused to do. The work of "*reform*" that had been intrusted to the Fathers of Basle was now set aside, and the *union of the Greek and Latin Churches* taken up by the Fathers of Ferrara and Florence. That the Council, opened at the former and continued at the latter city, was entirely independent of that of Basle, possessed all the qualifications of preceding general councils, and is correctly numbered among those designated *ecumenical,* there can be no doubt.

Things went on in the usual way until the arrival of the Greeks, in March, who again complicated matters by raising questions of precedence, prerogative, and others equally senseless and annoying, regarding the proper ceremonial to be observed in receiving the emperor and patriarch. So extravagant were the pretensions of the former that it was with difficulty he could be persuaded not to enter on horseback the church in which the Council was in session.

These trifles having been settled, the *united* Council of the Greek and Latin Churches, numbering one hundred and forty members, exclusive of abbots and other superiors of religious houses, was formally and solemnly declared *opened,* April 8, 1438, in the gloomy cathedral of Ferrara. A decree was passed ordering all whose duty or privilege it was to attend the Council to appear at Ferrara within four months. Owing to this delay, six months passed before the first general session of the Council was held (October 8th), after which the sessions were continued uninterruptedly until the sixteenth. According to a prearranged programme, the proceedings were to embrace all the palmary points of difference between the two Churches—viz: 1. The addition of the "*Filioque*" to the Symbol; 2. The procession of the Holy Ghost; 3. Purgatory and the condition of the blessed after death; 4. The Epiclesis of the Liturgy, or the invocation of the Holy Ghost as the consecrator; and the use of leavened and unleavened bread at the altar; 5. The Primacy; 6. Divorce, etc. The prolonged and wearisome discussions of the Greeks and Latins at *Ferrara* included all these *controverted* points, but were chiefly devoted to the inquiry as to whether the addition of the "*Filioque*" to the Symbol was lawful and capable of defense. The extraordinary charge made by *Marcus Eugenicus*, Archbishop of Ephesus, and *Anthony*, Archbishop of Heraclea, and supported in a restricted and milder form by *Bessarion*, Archbishop of Nice, the most eminent scholar among the Greeks, was unanswerably refuted by *Andrew*, Bishop of Rhodus (called *Colossensis*), but, if possible, still more ably by Cardinal *Julian Cesarini*, who pointed out that the "*Filioque*" was, accurately speaking, neither a change nor an addition, but simply an *explanatory* clause, intended to bring out the meaning of the Symbol *more fully* and *explicitly*, and that in making such verbal additions for the sake of clearness, the Latin Church might appeal to the precedent of the Council of Constantinople (381), which had introduced several explanatory clauses into the Symbol of Nice. *Louis*, Archbishop *of Forli*, further remarked that there existed no law of the Church forbidding explanatory words to be added to the Symbols.

During the sixteenth and last session held at Ferrara, the presence of a plague which seriously threatened the city, and the scarcity of food which was now commencing to be pressingly felt, led the Pope to transfer the Council to *Florence*, for which reason it takes its name from this city. Here the first session was held February 26, 1439. It was determined to proceed at once to the discussion of the doctrinal authorization of the "*Filioque;*" and the Latins set to work in earnest to confute the statement of the Greeks, that the addition implied the Manichaean error of a *twofold* principle of the Holy Ghost. Though frequently refuted and disclaimed, the charge was again and again urged by *Marcus*, Archbishop of Ephesus, whose chief opponent among the Latins was *Johannes a Ragusio*, the Dominican provincial of Lombardy. Each reproached the other with being needlessly prolix. The Dominican provincial, besides being ably assisted by *Ambrose Traversari*, a Camaldolite abbot, who supported his argument by many and copious extracts from the writings of the Greek Fathers, also skillfully availed himself of the very old manuscript copies of the works of St. John Damascene and of St. Basil against Eunomius, brought from Constantinople by Nicholas de Cusa, from the latter of which it was clearly shown that its illustrious author taught that the Holy Ghost proceeded, not from the Father only, *but from the Son also*. The debate was long, wearisome, and acrimonious. By order of the Emperor, Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, and Anthony, Archbishop of Heraclea, the two most bitter opponents to the union, abstained from the discussion, which was now chiefly confined to Archbishop *Bessarion*, whose enlightened views and conciliatory disposition paved the way to a reconciliation. *Joseph*, Patriarch *of Constantinople*, with his dying words, exhorted his countrymen to consummate the union.[1] At length the majority of the Greeks agreed to a joint profession of faith with the Latins on this most difficult of controverted points, which ran as follows: "*Since the Latin Fathers teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son as from one sole principle, and by one sole production, called spiration; and since their meaning is the same as that of the Greek Fathers, who teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son, therefore all obstacle to union is removed.*"

To a deputation of Greeks who visited Pope Eugene on the following day, he said: "We are now agreed as to the main point; and to bring about an immediate union, it only remains to clear up some minor questions concerning purgatory, the primacy, unleavened bread, and the form of consecration in the Mass."

---

[1] He was found dead at the table, and beside him, written in straggling hand, were the following words: "*Joseph, by the mercy of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch:* Being now at the end of my days, and about to pay the common debt of mankind, I wish, by the grace of God, to communicate, in open writ and over my own signature, my dying sentiments to all my spiritual children—'Whatever the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of ancient Rome believes and teaches, this do I believe and obey, and I do most solemnly confess that the Pope of ancient Rome is the Father of fathers, the sovereign Pontiff and Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ; and I also confess the doctrine of Purgatory. In witness whereof, I hereunto set my signature, this 9th day of June, 1439, of the second indiction.'"

The Latins and Greeks had already discussed the question of *Purgatory* in several conferences at Ferrara. The teaching of the Latin Church was clearly and precisely set forth by Cardinal Julian, but still more exhaustively by *John Turrecremata;* and a very doubtful and contradictory exposition of the Greek teaching was given by Marcus Eugenicus, who stated in conclusion that "he had formerly been under the impression that the two Churches were more at variance on this doctrine." The exposition of Bessarion was much clearer and more intelligible. He said the Greeks believed Purgatory to be a place of *suffering* or *punishment*, but rejected the idea of *fire* in this connection. When *fire* was mentioned as an agent of punishment they understood that of *Hell.* With regard to the departed, he said, some of the Greeks believed that neither the punishment of the wicked nor the happiness of the just would be *complete* until after the resurrection of the body, which before that time could participate in neither felicity nor misery. The Latins, on the contrary, held that the punishment of the wicked and the happiness of the just would be complete immediately after death. This opinion was after a time embraced by Bessarion, but vehemently opposed by Marcus Eugenicus. After some further discussion the Greeks drew up the following declaration which proved satisfactory to the Latins: "Shortly after death (but before the resurrection of the bodies), the souls of the just enjoy the plenitude of bliss, and the souls of the wicked the plenitude of suffering; others are in a middle state, where they are cleansed (purgation), but whether they suffer by agency of fire, or darkness, or whirlwind, or any other specific mode of punishment, is an open question."[1]

The question of the *azyme*, after having been ably discussed by John Turrecremata, was disposed of by the declaration of the Greeks that either leavened or unleavened bread might be used at the altar.

---

[1] Cf. *Loch*, The Dogma of Purgatory in the Greek Church, Ratisbon, 1842.

The controversy on *consecration* presented greater difficulties. The Greeks admitted that the efficient form of consecration were the words of institution (This is My Body), but contended that if they addressed a prayer (ἐπίκλησις) to God after consecration, begging Him by His Holy Ghost to change the Bread into the precious Body and the Cup into the precious Blood of His Son, the words were not to be taken literally, but as signifying an invocation of the Holy Ghost to descend upon the recipient, and change in him the Bread into the precious Body, etc., in the sense that the reception of the Sacrament might be to him unto the cleansing of his soul and the remission of his sins, and not unto judgment and condemnation.

The proposal on the part of the Latins to place the invocation before the form of consecration, or to select another, was rejected by the Greeks, who replied that it was to be found in the liturgies, not only of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom*, but also in those of St. Mark, and of the Armenians, Nestorians, and Copts. They further argued that something very similar was to be found in the Latin liturgy, in the words: "*Jube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, etc.*," which was also placed after the form of consecration. The Greeks did not think it worth while to seriously consider the strange objection of the Latins against their omission of the *Confiteor* before Mass.

The controversy on the *Primacy* of the Bishop of Rome was prolix, heated, occasionally intemperate, and at one time threatened to frustrate all the efforts thus far made toward union. The Emperor was particularly averse to admitting the claims of the Latins, and was repeatedly on the point of breaking off negotiations and departing for Constantinople. While ready to recognize the Primacy in theory, he resolutely refused to admit the practical conclusions to which such a concession would lead. He objected to appeals being made from the decision of patriarchs to the tribunal of the Holy See, and denied that the Pope enjoyed the exclusive right of convoking general councils. This right had been claimed by his predecessors, and to relinquish it would be to forego the shadow of supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs which he fancied was one of his prerogatives. But the Eastern prelates and theologians, who were beginning to understand that the freedom and independence of the Pope were the best guaranties of their own, did not share to the full the Emperor's opposition, and were more inclined than he to acknowledge papal supremacy. Among the foremost advocates of the Primacy on the side of the Latins were *John Turrecremata, John a Ragusio*, and the Camaldolite abbot, *Ambrose Traversari*, who, according to the testimony of the Greeks, was of all the Latins the most conversant with the writings of the Greek Fathers. The Emperor insisted, before admitting the Primacy of Rome, that instead of the current and sometimes rhetorical utterances of particular Greek doctors, specific *decrees of councils* should be quoted in its support. On the 26th of June, 1439, the Greeks finally presented the following formula as their ultimatum: " *We acknowledge the Pope to be the Sovereign Pontiff and Ruler, the Representative and Vicar of Christ, the Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, to the end that he may govern and rule the Church of God, but this without detriment to the rights and prerogatives of the Eastern Patriarchs. Of these, the next in dignity to the Pope, is he of Constantinople, to whom those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are subordinate in rank.*" They added the hope that the union might be consummated on the approaching 29th of June, the feast of the Princes of the Apostles. This consummation, however, was put off by the Greeks themselves, who took exception to several points in the decree of union (*Definitio Fidei*, ὅρος), drawn up by Anthony Traversari. They found fault with the heading because to the name and title "*Eugenius episcopus, servus servorum Dei*," those of the Eastern Patriarchs and that of the Emperor were not added. The latter wished to have the passage concerning the Pope changed, and the word *omnibus* inserted in the clause " *salvis juribus et privilegiis quatuor Patriarcharum.*" The Pope consented to accept all the modifications, and in this amended form the *Definitio* was subscribed to by the Greeks, Sunday, July 5, 1439.

On the following day Pope Eugene sang pontifical High Mass, at which both Latins and Greeks assisted. During the solemnity, Cardinal *Julian* read the full profession of faith in

Latin, and Archbishop *Bessarion* in Greek, to which the Latin and Greek prelates, the plenipotentiaries of the Russians, Iberians, Wallachians, and of the Emperor of Trebisond assented by acclamation.

Of the *Deed of Union* we give the following extracts:

"Decree of the Holy Ecumenical Synod of Florence, Eugene, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, in perpetual remembrance, with the assent of our beloved Son in Christ, John Palaeologus, the Illustrious Emperor of the Romans, and of the delegates of our venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs and other representatives of the Greek Church.

"Let the heavens rejoice and the earth break forth in songs of gladness. The wall of separation has fallen; the East and the West are not now, as in days past, two Churches, but one. Christ has again united them, and they are now bound together by the strong bonds of love and peace. The dreary days of schism are past, and the glorious splendor of a long-desired union brings light and gladness to all mankind. Who that is able now to make a worthy thank-offering to Almighty God? Truly is this the work of God and to be celebrated with heavenly song."

The formularies settling controversies centuries old, between the Greeks and Latins, are here given, and the decree goes on:

"Furthermore, we define that the Holy Apostolical See and the Bishop of Rome enjoy a primacy throughout the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor to Blessed Peter, Prince of Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the Universal Church, and of all Christians the Father and Teacher; that to him was given, in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the fullness of power to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church, as is also set forth in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the Sacred Canons."[1]

---

[1] Of the few (four or five) copies of the Deed of Union in Greek and Latin, *with the autograph signature of the Greek Emperor*, one is extant in the public archives of the Grand Duchy of Baden at Carlsruhe, which is supposed to date back to Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. In 1853, John Peter *Secchi*, S. J., librarian of the Roman College and brother of the celebrated astronomer in

In the list of subscriptions to this Deed of Union, the names of the Pope and the cardinals come first; next, that of the Greek Emperor, after which follow the prelates of both parties; the whole number of subscribers being thirty-two Greeks and one hundred and fourteen Latins, of whom eighteen were cardinals, two patriarchs, eight archbishops, and forty-seven bishops. Pope Eugene was much pained by the refusal of Marcus Eugenicus to subscribe.

After the solemn promulgation of this decree, Eugene requested the Greeks to give their assent to some further measures of lesser importance, the most notable of which were the following: 1. To make adultery no longer the cause of the dissolution of marriage; 2. To punish Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, for his stubborn resistance to the union; 3. To elect, before leaving Florence, a patriarch to fill the place of Joseph of Constantinople, deceased, that he might confirm their choice. The Greeks, to the first proposal, replied that henceforth they would limit still further the causes of divorce, and grant it only in extreme cases; to the second, that they would inflict adequate punishment on Marcus Eugenicus after their return; and to the third, that they must decline to comply, since ancient usage required that the patriarch should be elected in Constantinople and consecrated in the principal church of that city.

Rome, made use of it in preparing an edition of the Council of Florence. The definition given above, on the Primacy, both as to the wording and orthography, runs as follows in that important document:

Ἔτι ὁρίζομεν, τὴν ἁγίαν ἀποστολικὴν καθέδραν καὶ τὸν ῥωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερέα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ πρωτεῖον κατέχειν, αὐτὸν τε τὸν ρωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερέα διάδεχον εἶναι τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου, τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἀληθῆ τοποτηρητὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ. καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας κεραλὴν καὶ πάντων τῶν χριστιανῶν πατέρα καὶ διδάσκαλον ὑπάρχειν. καὶ αὐτῶ ἐν τῶ μακαρίω Πέτρω, τοῦ ποιμαίνειν καὶ διϊθύνειν καὶ κυβερνᾶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίω ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ, πλήρη ἐζουσίαν παραδέδοσθαι. καθ’ ὅν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται.

Item diffinimus sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri Principis Apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis ycumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris Canonibus continetur.

That the Pope dealt considerately with the Greeks is evident from the fact that he granted them, among other concessions, permission to retain all their peculiar ecclesiastical customs and usages, their ritual, and even the *marriage of priests.*

That portion of *the Latin text of the decree referring to the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome*, which has been in earlier and more recent times seriously objected to, and even branded as an interpolated reading, has been found, after careful investigation, to be genuine and authentic, and precisely the same with that which, *after much haggling and laborious discussion, was finally agreed upon* by the Latins and Greeks, accepted, and subscribed to by both.[1]

---

[1] The Acts of the Council, in *Harduin*, T. IX.; *Mansi*, T. XXXI., p. 459 sq.; in *Labbeus* et *Cossart*, T. XIII., penned probably by *Bessarion.* Ἡ *ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ ἐν φλωρεντία σύνοδος διὰ μοναχοῦ* Βενεδικτίνου (*P. Nikes*), *ἐν ῥώμη*, 1864. A work was written from a strong Greck partisan bias, entitled "Vera historia unionis non verae inter Graecos et Latinos, sive Concilii Florent. exactissima narratio graece scripta per Sylvest. Sguropolum (rather, Syropolum) magnum Ecclesiarcham, qui Concilio interfuit, transtulit in serm. lat. *Rob. Creyghton*, Hag. Com. 1690 f. Against the partisan author and blundering translator, *Leonis Allatii* in Rob. Creygthoni apparatum, version. et notas ad hist. Conc. Florentini scriptam a Sylv. Syrop. exercitationum Pars prior. Rom. 1665, 4to; a pars *posterior* did not make its appearance. Cf. above, the works quoted at the head of this section, of *Hefele*, *Pichler*, *Zhismann*, and *Frommann*. *Döllinger's* latest objection (*Augsburg Univ. Gaz.*, Jan. 19, 1870, and *Janus*, Lps. 1869, p. 347) *to the Latin text on the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome* is not new, but merely a repetition of what *Peter de Marca*, *Maimbourg*, *Launoy*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Bossuet*, *Febronius*, and others erroneously maintained. In the first place, Döllinger accepted, without investigation, the statement of Archbishop *de Marca* (De concord. sacerdot. et Imper., lib. III., c. 8, nro. 5), and the ex-Jesuit *Maimbourg* (Traité historique de l'établissement et des prérogatives de l'église de Rome, 1685, chaps. 5 and 20), whilst he maintained that the connecting link of the closing words—"'*Quemadmodum etiam*' in gestis oecum. concilior. et in sacris canonibus continetur"—was a forgery of Bartholomew Abram of Crete, and introduced by him into his historical work. He says that, according to the supposed original Greek text by *Flavio Biondo*, secretary of Pope Eugene IV., it must be read: "Quemadmodum *et* in gestis — — *et* canonibus" (lib. X., decad. 3). He further says that, according to the authorities which Maimbourg *pretends* to have brought to light, the *καθ' ὃν τρόπον* should be translated by *Juxta* eum modum qui, etc. On the other hand, *Emmanuel Schelstrate*, Tractatus de sensu et auctorit. decreti Constant. conc. 1686, praefat. IV., immediately proved, against de Marca, that in all the manuscript copies of the Florentine Decree of Union, and particularly in the unquestionably original text of Florence, the words "*quemadmodum etiam*" are to be found. Still later, *Anthony Vaira* (De praerogativa Rom. Pont. a Constantinopolit. praesuli-

Apart from the direct expenses of the Council, Eugene was obliged to make other heavy outlays in behalf of the Greeks, who were gratuitously supported and received each a certain fixed allowance in money. Moreover, he had pledged his word to the Emperor John, to provide *speedy and efficient aid against the Turks*, which he was now called upon to furnish. To maintain a garrison at Constantinople, he contracted with

---

bus usurpata, Patav. 1704, p. 891) showed that the "*juxta*" was an invention of *Maimbourg*, because every author quoted by the latter has "*quemadmodum*," not "*juxta*." Again, when *Febronius* (De statu eccles., c. V., § 4, n. 5, A. D. 1763) undertook to defend the reading "quemadmodum *et*," he was refuted by *Mamachi* and *Zaccaria* (see below, § 370). Döllinger's reading, which, as has been seen, is the same as that of Febronius, has quite recently been proved to be erroneous in a comprehensive article by *Cecconi* (*Univers*, February 6, 1870), and in an exhaustive work entitled "*Criticism of the Florentine Decree of Union*" (Lps. 1870), by *Theodor. Frommann*, a Protestant scholar, who resided a long time in Italy. Both of these writers proved that all *original* Latin *documents* and the *numerous duplicate copies*, now extant, of the Florentine decree, and particularly *those* preserved in the libraries and archives of Florence, Rome, Venice, Bologna, Milan, London, and Paris (to which, according to what has been stated at page 938, may be added that of Carlsruhe), contain the "*quemadmodum etiam*." Hence *Frommann* says: "It is to be regretted (sic!) that the fact (?) on which the assertion of Döllinger mainly rests is entirely without foundation. In all the copies of the decree we have been able to examine, we have uniformly found '*etiam*.'" Frommann agrees with the Civiltà *Cattolica* in its explanation of the probable origin of the reading "*et—et*." He says: "The *et—et* of Flavio Biondo and the other writers who have followed him may have originated from a mistake of the copyist, who mistook the abbreviated form of *etiam* for *et*. Hence," he concludes, "*Abramus Cretensis, the collectors of councils, and authors of dogmatic text-books*, must be absolved from the imputation (Döllinger's) of having *forged documents*." It also appears, from careful investigation into the *origin* of this final sentence of the decree, that the *Latins* were the authors of the *definitive* portions of it, and that the Greek reading, καθ' ὃν τρόπον was accidentally substituted for the simple καθώς. "Hence," says Frommann (l. c., pp. 52, 53), "there is not the faintest suspicion that the Latins attempted, from dishonest motives, to corrupt the text." On the other hand, it must be frankly stated here that during the course of the heated discussion concerning the precise form of this closing definition of the decree, the Greek Emperor and his theologians stubbornly refused to admit the *papal prerogatives* "*as they are expressed in Holy Scriptures and in the writings of the saints;*" because, they said, the testimonies of the latter (relative to the primacy of the Pope) are doubtful or unauthenticated—sometimes too rhetorical, and not unfrequently conveyed in the complimentary phraseology of correspondence. Hence they demanded that the sense of the definition should be: "The Pope enjoys his prerogatives as defined by the *canons and the acts of ecumenical councils*," an amendment to which the Latins finally agreed. It is not difficult, the banking-house of the Medici, in Venice, a loan of 12,000 ducats.[1]

The temper exhibited by the bulk of the Greek people in regard to the act of union in no wise corresponded to the hopeful anticipations of Eugene, and was but a poor compensation for the immense sacrifices and earnest efforts that had been made to effect a reconciliation.[2] Marcus Eugenicus, who had preceded his colleagues to Constantinople, excited the prejudices and appealed to the national antipathies of the people; while the Emperor, naturally weak and vacillating, but now borne down with grief on account of the death of his third empress, Mary Comnena of Trebisond, unnecessarily deferred the election of a patriarch. This delay greatly contributed to exasperate the more uncompromising, and to excite disorders among the populace.

The former complained that the signers of the Florentine Decree had attempted to Latinize the Greeks, and the latter that they had put their trust in the Latins instead of God Almighty. So intense was the fury of the populace, that they went about the city shouting: "Away with the Azymites! the Blessed Virgin will not allow our city to be destroyed; we have no need of the Latins; we had rather be under the Turks than the Romans."

The promulgation of the Decree was the occasion of excited demonstrations in the churches and of riotous tumult in the streets. The Basilica of St. Sophia was believed to have been desecrated by the ceremony. The internal peace of the Empire was seriously threatened and its power of resistance to the Turks greatly impaired. The new Patriarch, *Metrophanes* of Cyzicus, in spite of the energy displayed in his efforts to carry the articles of the Florentine Decree into

---

therefore, to understand how, on the one hand, the Greeks fancied they had depressed, and, on the other, the Latins that they had exalted the primacy of the Pope by this last clause. Cf. *Hergenröther*, The "Errors" of above Four Hundred Bishops and their Theological Censor (Döllinger), Freiburg, 1870.

[1] Cf. *Frommann*, Critical Supplements toward a History of the Church Union of Florence, Halle, 1872, p. 188–190.

[2] The *same*, l. c., p. 191–239, brings many, and, in part, new details on the vicissitudes of the union until its dissolution, which particulars, however, frequently call for a careful revision and amendment.

effect amid scenes of violence was unable to withstand the tide of popular feeling, or to make head against the opposition of his adversaries. The leader of these was *Arsenius*, Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappodocia, who together with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem assembled at the last-named city (1442–43), drew up and published two documents, in one of which, bearing the date of April, 1443, they summoned, under menace of excommunication, all ecclesiastics appointed by the Patriarch Metrophanes to at once leave off exercising their functions; and in the other, issued December, 1442, threatened to omit the name of the Emperor in the prayers of the Church, unless he would denounce the Synod of Florence and exert his influence to have the Latins strike out the "*Filioque*" from the Symbol. Before the Emperor, now engaged in a war against the despotic Demetrius, who was opposed to the union, could convoke a counter synod at Constantinople, the Patriarch Metrophanes died (August 1, 1443). This event postponed indefinitely the consummation of the act of union. In 1445, *Gregory Mammas*, one of the ablest defenders of the Greek cause at Florence, but now an advocate of union, was raised to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. Being a man of character and strong will his opponents were naturally anxious to be rid of him, and accordingly, after the death of the Emperor John (October 31, 1448), he was deposed under the new Emperor *Constantine*, in a synod held at Constantinople in 1450. His successor, *Athanasius*, after the sudden death of Marcus Eugenicus, found an equally zealous and vehement advocate of the cause of opposition in *George Scholarius*.[1] The Emperor Constantine, being honestly desirous of putting down all opposition to the union, frustrated the efforts of Athanasius and Scholarius; and the former in consequence resigned the patriarchate, and the latter, under the assumed name of Gennadius, retired to the quiet of the cloister.

---

[1] *Leo Allatius*, when engaged in writing his work—De ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione—received the acts of this synod, and had them printed (p. 1380 sq.) in the appendix to his work, declaring, however, and justly so, that on account of gross anachronisms and intrinsic contradictions, he considered them counterfeit. (See *Hefele*, Tübg. Quart. 1848, p. 212.) The fact of the *existence*, however, *of that synod* can not well be called into doubt. Cf. *Frommann*, Crit. Suppl., p. 222 sq.

Bessarion, deeply afflicted by the hostility of the Byzantine clergy to the Florentine Decree, withdrew from Constantinople and took up his residence in Rome, a step which he was all the more ready to take inasmuch as he had been created a cardinal. Gregory, the deposed Patriarch, had also gone to Rome to work as best he could in the interest of his country.

Nicholas V., Eugene's successor, continued to send aid for the prosecution of the war against the Turks, and the better to interest the West in behalf of their menaced brethren of the East, sought to arrange for a demonstration at Constantinople, whose object would be the public recognition of the Florentine Decree. For this purpose, he sent to Constantinople, Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kiew, who, having been exiled for his advocacy of the union, sought refuge at Rome, where, like Bessarion, he had been created a cardinal. He was selected because, being a Greek by birth, and intimately acquainted with the internal affairs of his native country, he seemed best qualified to improve the circumstances which now appeared to favor a reconciliation between the East and West. His special mission was to bring the Emperor and the majority of the clergy to acknowledge, as soon as possible, by some public act the articles of the Florentine Decree; and in this he was successful, and on the 12th of December, 1452, celebrated the Feast of Union in the Church of St. Sophia, and there offered public prayer for the Pope and for *Gregory* the exiled Patriarch. On receipt of this news Nicholas made fresh efforts to succor the East, and sent a fleet to the defense of Constantinople, which, unfortunately, did not arrive until the city, after a gallant struggle, had yielded to the desperate onset of the Turks, May 29, 1453. The brave and noble Constantine XI., the last of the Palaeologi, perished in the thick of the fight. The splendid Church of St. Sophia was speedily transformed from a Christian temple to a Turkish mosque. Cardinal Isidore, who had been an eye-witness of the storming and sack of the city of Constantine,[1] and had barely escaped with his life, gave a detailed account of the disaster when he arrived at Rome.

---

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, in his third art., "Temporary Reunion," etc. (Tübg. Quart. 1848, p. 224 sq.)

As the Greek Emperor's attachment to the union had operated effectually in securing aid from the West, his victorious conqueror, Mohammed II., did all in his power, consistent with his own interests, to oppose the union, and for the twofold purpose of carrying out this policy and conciliating the Christians, on the fourth day after the taking of Constantinople, had the monk *Gennadius*, who was hostile to the Florentine Decree, placed on the patriarchal throne. Gennadius, thus placed in the highest position in the Greek Church, won the confidence of the Sultan, and thereby secured many privileges and immunities for his fellow-Christians; but in his determined hostility to Rome he never changed. He withdrew, after some years, to the solitude of the cloister, where he died in 1464. His successors in the patriarchal office, Isidore II., Joseph II., and *Symeon* of Trebisond, were equally averse to any reconciliation with Rome, and the last-named convoked a synod at Constantinople in 1472, which denounced the Florentine Decree in harsh and uncompromising language.[1]

When information of the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches reached the Asiatic tribes, many of them entered into negotiations looking toward a return to Rome.[2] Pope Eugene, in consequence of these overtures, caused the Council of Florence to remain in session after the departure of the Greeks, August 26, 1439.

In the interval, a permanent union was brought about, first, with the *Maronites*, and next with the *Armenians* (1440), to whom Pope Eugene issued a comprehensive doctrinal decree, and permitted them the use of their own language in the liturgy.[1] Their example was rapidly followed by the *Jacobites* and the Christians of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Chaldea.[2] The Council was transferred (April 26, 1442), to the Lateran in Rome, where it gradually decreased in numbers, and finally terminated in 1445.

---

[1] Concerning the apostasy from the union, rich materials relative to the more important details are to be found in the *Τόμος καταλλαγῆς*, published at Jassy (1692–1694), by *Dositheus*, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and chiefly composed of the writings of those who opposed the union and of acts of synods held for the same purpose. Of this work, however, little is generally known. Cf. *Gams*, *Möhler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 644, note 1, and *Simonides*, *'Ορθοδόξων 'Ελλήνων θεολ. γραφαί*, London, 1865. (Fragments from the Correspondence of the Patriarch Gennadius).

[2] Cf. *Wilh. Tyr.*, lib. XXII., c. 8. *Bonn* Review, nro. 16, p. 232 sq., and nro. 17, p. 239 sq. †**Kunstmann*, The Maronites and their Relation to the Latin Church (Tübg. Quart. Rev. 1845, nro. 1, p. 40–54).

Amid the general defection of the Greek Church in its two great representative branches of Constantinople and Moscow, occasioned by the Florentine Decree, the accession of these isolated but not unimportant Asiatic churches, afforded some consolation, but was far from compensating for the loss sustained. Neither was the action of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who, in 1460, and on a subsequent occasion, declared in favor of union, of much significance, since their action was prompted by political rather than religious motives, inasmuch as they hoped, through the efforts of *Pius II.*, to obtain their deliverance from the yoke of the Turks.[3]

---

[1] Cf. the Acts, in *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1015–1018, and *Labbei* et *Cossart.* Conc., T. XIII., p. 1197 sq. The *Decretum pro Armenis*, also in *Denzinger's* Enchiridion symbolor. et definitionum. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 569 sq.

[2] The Acts, in *Labbei* et *Cossart.* T. XIII., p. 1204 sq. *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1021 sq. The Decretum pro Jacobitis, also in *Denzinger*, l. c.; the Decretum pro Syris et pro Chaldaeis et Maronitis, in *Labb.* et *Cossart.* T. XIII., p. 1222 sq. *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1041 sq.

[3] Cf. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, T. II., p. 770.

CHAPTER II.

HERESIES AND HERETICAL SECTS.

§ 279. *John Wickliffe* (A. D. 1324–1384).

Writings of John Wicliff, Lond. 1836. *Henricus de Knyghton* (canon of Leicester and Wickliffe's contemporary), De eventibus Angliae usque ad a. 1395 (*Twisden*, Scriptor. histor. Angl., Lond. 1652 f.) — *Thom. Walsingham* (Benedictine of St. Alban's, about 1440), Hist. Anglica major. (*Camdeni* Scriptores rerum Anglicarum, Lond. 1574; Frcf. 1602 f.) The two principal works: *Lewis*, Hist. of the life and sufferings of J. Wicliff, Lond. (1720); Oxf. 1836. *Rob. Vaughan*, Life and opinions of John de Wycliffe, Lond. (1829) 1831, 2 T. Both these works have been written from an altogether Protestant point of view. Conf. also *Ruever Gronemann*, Diatribe in J. W. reformationis prodromi vitam, ingenium, scripta, Traj. 1837. *Weber*, Hist. of the non-Catholic churches and sects in Great Britain, Lps. 1845. The errors of Wickliffe are methodically exposed by *Staudenmaier*, in his Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 667–682. *Pluquet*, Dict. des Hérésies, art. J. Wickliffe, Paris, 1847. **Schwab*, Gerson, p. 528–546. *Wm. Shirley*, Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri J. Wyclif (ed. 1858).

The opposition which the sectaries had offered to the Church during the preceding epoch, assumed a more marked and determined character in the present. This was especially noticeable in the case of *John Wickliffe*, who seems to have been the representative of every false principle of philosophy and every erroneous doctrine of theology current during this age throughout the Church of the West.

He was born at Wickliffe on the Tees, in Yorkshire, A. D. 1324, and at the age of sixteen was sent to Oxford, where he studied Aristotelian philosophy, scholastic theology, and laws, under Thomas Bradwardine. He possessed an extensive knowledge of Holy Scripture, was a skillful dialectician, and an astute and subtle reasoner. While still a youth he is said to have predicted the approaching downfall of the Church, in the apocalyptic language of the abbot *Joachim de Floris*. Wickliffe became more bold as time went on, and when, in 1350, Edward III., King of England, attempted by act of Parliament to set aside the right of suzerainty conferred by

John Lackland on Pope Innocent III., he wrote a dissertation, the object of which was to prove that the tribute hitherto paid to Rome by the English nation, was entirely without sanction of law. He moreover preached a sermon, in which he styled the Pope "Antichrist, the arrogant and worldly priest of Rome, and the accursed extortioner."

Wickliffe, in 1360, entered with acrimonious bitterness upon the controversy which the University of Oxford was carrying on against the Mendicant Orders, in the course of which he said, that to enter an Order of begging friars, and to forego all hope of Heaven, were acts of equivalent import.

The zeal which he had exhibited in resisting the claims of the Pope to the right of tribute from the English nation, gained him the favor of the crown, and in the year 1372, he took the degree of Doctor of Theology, and obtained *a professorship of Divinity* at the University of Oxford.

His name stood second among the royal commissioners sent to Bruges, in 1374, to confer with the papal legates on the questions then in dispute between the Court of Rome and Edward III., King of England. Here he became intimate with John of Ghent, son of Edward, whom he found to entertain feelings quite as hostile as his own toward the Church. While on this mission he was fully informed of the disordered state of affairs at the Papal Court of Avignon, and on his return to England, lost no time in putting his information to the best account. He proceeded at once to attack the Pope, and was not over nice in his choice of epithets or sparing in the use of invective.

Courtenay, Bishop of London, by order of Gregory XI., summoned him to appear before a synod held at St. Paul's, to answer to nineteen articles drawn up against him, charging him with holding heretical opinions. But this examination came to nothing. John of Ghent, and Lord Percy, Earl Marshal, appeared at the synod in support of Wickliffe, to overawe by their presence any who might be bold or conscientious enough to take action against him. Though their conduct to Courtenay was rude and insolent, this prelate behaved toward them with mildness and dignity, but their acts at length became so offensive that the populace set upon them with tumultuous violence and forced them to consult for their safety in flight. This put an end to the synod and left things just where they were at starting. These proceedings, though no good came of them, served to embitter the mind of Wickliffe, and it was not till this time that his character as an heresiarch became open and decided.

He maintained that *the judgment of the Church* is *not a necessary condition to certitude in* matters of *faith*, and *that every* individual *Christian is*, by the grace of Christ, absolutely *certain of the truth of what he believes;* that *Holy Scripture*, of which private judgment is the only legitimate and adequate interpreter, is at once the *only source and rule of faith; that there is no* such thing as *transubstantiation* in the Holy Eucharist; and that the papacy and episcopacy are not of divine institution.

He also asserted that any bishop or priest who had fallen into mortal sin could not validly administer the sacraments; that auricular confession is a meaningless and empty ceremony, inasmuch as interior sorrow is quite sufficient for the forgiveness of sins ; that if the Pope should chance to be an immoral man, he would thereby pass under the dominion of Satan, and cease to have any authority over the faithful; that the clergy, who possess of the goods of this world are living in direct violation of Holy Writ; that even kings and princes, once they have fallen into grievous sin, should straightway abdicate their authority, as *it is absolutely necessary that one, who would hold power, should be in the state of grace.*[1]

The teaching of Wickliffe, besides favoring *the doctrine of unqualified predestination*, led, when pursued to its limits, to the complete overthrow of the great principles of both civil and ecclesiastical polity, because, *from his point of view, morality and legality were convertible terms*, the former being a condition of the latter.

---

[1] He arrived at this conclusion *by basing theological doctrine on the practices of feudalism.* He argued that forfeiture is universally admitted to be the just punishment of treason, and that, since every mortal sin is treason against God, the offender should be punished by forfeiting whatever he holds of him. But, as authority comes from God, this should also be forfeited. (Tr.)

Moreover, both Wickliffe himself, and his itinerant preachers, whom he called "poor priests," and who went up and down the country inveighing against the wealth of the clergy and the artificial distinctions by which one class of men were set above another, did much to stimulate, if they did not actually inspire that spirit of revolt which culminated in the peasants' insurrection of 1381. The insurgents were speedily put down, and Wickliffe was summoned in the following year to appear before an assembly of eight bishops and fourteen doctors at the Greyfriars, in London. He refused to obey the citation and brought forward as his excuse and defense the privileges of the University. The assembly went on with its work without him, and, out of twenty-four articles gathered from his writings, ten were branded as *heretical*, and fourteen as *erroneous*.[1]

This decision of the bishops was publicly proclaimed in London, and received the sanction of the civil authority. Wickliffe himself was deprived of his professorship at Oxford by royal order, and both he and his adherents expelled the University. From Oxford he went to the parish of Lutterworth, where he spent the remainder of his days, and died two years later, on the Feast of Innocents, A. D. 1384.[2]

While living in retirement at this country-seat, Wickliffe wrote his principal work, entitled the *Trialogus*,[3]—a work in which his bitter opposition to the Church and her doctrines is most fully and *systematically* developed.[4]

---

[1] On this London synod, compare *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1889 sq.; *Mansi*, T. XXVI., p. 695.

[2] He was assisting at the Mass of his curate, and, at the moment of the elevation of the Host, was deprived of the use of his tongue and most of his limbs by a stroke of apoplexy. (Tr.)

[3] *Trialogus;* more full, *Joannis Wiclefi*, viri undequaque püssimi, dialogor., libb. IV., Bas. 1525, 4to; ed. *Wirth*, Frcf. et Lps. 1753 (lib. I. de Deo et ideis; lib. II. de creat. mundi; lib. III. de virtutibus et vitiis; lib. IV. de ecclesia, sacramentis, etc.) Concerning his other works, see *Lewis*, p. 143, and especially his treatise, "De ideis."

[4] There is an excellent criticism of Wickliffe in *Thomas Waldensis*, Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei (against the errors of Wickliffe and Huss), ed. Paris, 1521–32 f.; ed. *J. Rubens*, Venet. 1571 f.; ed. *Blanciotti*, Venet. 1757–59 f. Cf. also *Lewald*, Wickliffe's Theological Doctrine (Journal of Historical Theology, 1846 and 1847).

In giving an outline of his system, and of the great principles which imparted to it life and character, it is necessary to keep in view his ideology, which very nearly resembled that of *Amalric de Bena*, and was therefore essentially pantheistic.[1] Wickliffe's pantheistic creed may be formulated briefly thus: "*All nature is God; every being is God.*"[2] The following proposition embraces his fundamental notion of the way in which *ideas* are apprehended: "*Anything, the idea of which exists in the mind of God, is God Himself;*" or, "*The idea is God.*" It is indeed difficult to conceive how Wickliffe should not have been struck with the untenableness of his first principles, when he himself was led to conclude, by reasoning from them, that "an ass is God."[3] He even went the length of asserting that the proposition, "God is the idea," or, conversely, "the idea is God," is capable of scriptural proof.[4]

This principle once accepted, his system admitted of easy and rapid development. The *eternal reality* of all things and the *infinite duration of time* followed as necessary consequences; and the assertion of Abelard, that "God could not have created, if He would, a greater number of beings than He in fact did create," was common to Wickliffe also. Creation, according to this doctrine, in as far as God had anything to do with it at all, was but an *emanation, and whatever did take place*,[5] the evil as well as the good, *took place by a law of necessity*, and could not have happened otherwise than it did. God Himself is the creature of this law, and His freedom of action is no more than a willing acceptance of the conditions which it lays upon Him. Necessity is therefore implied in the very conception of a God. It is, as it were, a condition of His being. But, if both Creator and creature are so hemmed about by the law of necessity as to be completely and hopelessly under its control, it follows that there is such a thing as an *eternal*, *absolute*, and unqualified *predestination*, and, if so, to speak of the free-will of either God or man is arrant nonsense. Nor is this all. If *everything is under the law of absolute necessity, this must not be left out of sight in putting an estimate upon the work accomplished by Christ*, and in forming a judgment upon the whole history of the world.

---

[1] For proofs, see *Staudenmaier*, l. c., yet frequently misinterpreted and misapplied. More solidly and correctly given in *Schwab*, p. 527–546.

[2] Among the condemned propositions are also found the following: Quaelibet creatura est Deus; quodlibet est Deus. Ubique omne ens est, cum omne ens sit Deus, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 407. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 751; besides, compare *Harduin*, T. VII., pp. 1867, 1870 sq., 1890 sq.; T. VIII., pp. 203, 260, 263, 280, 299 sq., 909 sq., 1675; Tom. IX., pp. 1929, 1945.

[3] Wickliffe's own words: Et si dicatur, quod male sonat, concedere *asinum* et quodlibet aliud esse Deum, conceditur apud aegre intelligentes, ideo multi non admittunt talia, nisi cum determinatione, ut talis creatura secundum esse intelligibile, vel ideale quod habet in Deo ad intra, est Deus. Illi autem, qui habent eundem sensum per subjectum per se positum, aeque concedunt propositionem simplicem. De ideis, c. 2.

[4] Unde sic converto istam propositionem: omnis creatura est Deus. Deus est quaelibet creatura in esse intelligibili, et istam conversionem videtur Apostolus docere nos, ubi non dicit absolute, quod Deus est omnia, sed cum additamento: Deus est omnia in omnibus, ac si diceret: *Deus est omnes rationes ideales in omnibus creaturis.* De ideis, c. 2.

[5] He says, without figure: Cum omnia, quae eveniunt, *de necessitate* eveniunt, absolute necessarium est, quod damnandus ponat obicem in peccando (Trialog., lib. III., c. 7, 23; lib. IV., c. 13). Recolo me dixisse in libro I., quod omnia, quae eveniunt, necessario absolute eveniunt (lib. III., c. 8). Conf. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 407; *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 751.

Wickliffe delighted in putting a sinister interpretation upon everything, in attributing everything to an evil influence. In his judgment, all the scientific and literary institutions established after the tenth century, and particularly the religious orders, which, he said, had been shaken from the tail of the great dragon, were diabolical in origin, pagan in character, and in the prosperity of which the Church and the Devil were about equally interested.[1]

Although Wickliffe made his translation of the Bible from the Vulgate, and introduced into it the poison of his errors with the special purpose of disseminating these among the people, it is a little remarkable that the great bulk of his adherents were from among the better classes. His followers were designated by the name of *Lollards*, and during the reign of Henry V., who acted by the advice of the Carmelite, *Thomas Waldensis* († A. D. 1431), they were pursued with such energy as to be almost entirely suppressed. Their errors, however, were again revived in Bohemia, and, on this account, the Council of Constance passed sentence of anathema upon Wickliffe many years after his death.

§ 280. *John Huss* (1373–1415)—*The Hussites*.[2]

Mistra Jana Husi Spisy ceské, etc. (Master John Huss' complete works, in the Bohemian language), published, for the first time, by *K. J. Erben*, Prague, 1865–66. So far, fourteen numbers have appeared. —— Historia et monumenta J. Huss et Hieronym. Prag., etc., Norimbergae, 1558, 1715, 2 T. *Stumpff*, The Great General Council of Constance, etc., see above, § 271. Act of Councils, in *von der Hardt*, cf. literature heading, § 271. *Harduin*, T. VIII., *Mansi*, T. XXVII. *Cochlaeus*, Hist. Hussitarum, Mogunt. 1549. †*Höfler*, Historians of the Hussite Troubles in Bohemia, Vienna, 1856–66, 3 vols. *Palacky*, Hist. of the Bohemians, Vol. III., especially Pts. II. and III. *Helfert*, Huss and Jerome, Prague, 1853. *Henke*, John Huss and the Synod of Constance, Brl. 1869. Cf. *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. 31, p. 350 sq.; Vol. 39, p. 699–724; Vol. 41, p. 529–558; and *Bonn* Review of Theol. Lit. 1870, p. 422 and p. 675–679. *Schwab*, Gerson, p. 546–608. *E. Bonnechose*, Réformateurs avant la Reformation du XVIème siècle: Jean Hus, Gerson et le Concile de Constance, IIIème ed. Paris, 1860. †**Berger*, John Huss and King Sigismund, Augsburg, 1871, with complete bibliography.

---

[1] *Omnes religiones* (of monks) *indifferenter introductae sunt a diabolo.* — Universitates, studia, collegia, graduationes et magisteria in eisdem sunt vana gentilitate introducta, et tantum prosunt ecclesiae sicut diabolus. (*Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 300, 301. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., pp. 633, 634—namely, Sess. VIII. Conc. Constant.

[2] We still retain here the customary English spelling of this name with a double *ss*, although it is *Hus* in Bohemian, and means a goose, whereas Huss would, by a Czech, be pronounced like Hush. *Hefele's* art. in the *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, V. 402. (Tr.)

Three causes contributed to the Hussite movement in Bohemia; the eager desire of the nobility to get possession of the wealth of the clergy; the false mysticism into which the teachings, at first free from all tinge of error, of the parish priest *Conrad Waldhauser,* of the archdeacon *Milicz* of Kremsier, and his disciple *Matthias* of Janow, eventually developed; and finally, the theological controversy occasioned by the surreptitious introduction of the writings of *Wickliffe* into the University of Prague. Such were the materials ready at hand to which *Huss* set the torch, and which shortly supplied abundant fuel for a mighty conflagration.

Born July 6, 1369, at Hussinecz, a village of Bohemia, situated within the circle of Prachin, and close to the Bavarian border, Huss studied philosophy and theology at the University of Prague, where he took the master's degree in 1396, and became professor in 1398. Here the contests, which had arisen between the Germans and Czechs, for the enjoyment of the burses, were then heated and acrimonious. Huss was next chosen dean of the philosophical faculty, and appointed preacher at the Bethlehem Chapel, founded for the Bohemians, where sermons were delivered only in the *vulgar* tongue.

A forged document, purporting to be the approval of Wickliffe's orthodoxy by the University of Oxford, and bearing the official seal of that institution, was brought to Prague and publicly read. On the authority of this fraudulent document, the writings of Wickliffe were scattered through the city, and their teachings embraced by Huss and his disciples.

Among the most ardent advocates of the new teachings were the noblemen, *Nicholas Faulfisch* and *Jerome of Prague.*. Huss translated the *Trialogus* into Bohemian, but being deficient in speculative powers, he could neither appreciate the full import of the original, nor defend the ultimate consequences to which its principles would lead. Though lacking the ability to make the doctrines of Wickliffe his own in any adequate sense, as is notably the case in those on the personality of Christ and unconditional predestination, he nevertheless declared in the dictatorial tone and coarse language so characteristic of him, that the censures passed upon the writings of that heretic were false and unjust. He took occasion in his *sermons*[1] to praise the teachings of Wickliffe, to excite the people against the clergy, and to commend the laudable avocation of two young Englishmen, who sought to rouse popular feeling against the hierarchy and, for the furtherance of their cause, had recourse to the exhibition of obscene pictures. His fiery denunciation of the Pope and ecclesiastical abuses were so violent as to sometimes excite the indignation of his audience. He was once stopped in one of those furious philippics, of which he gave so many, by a man who cried out to him : " Master, I have been in Rome, have seen the Pope and the Cardinals, but affairs are not so bad as you represent." "And if you are so great an admirer of the Pope," said Huss, " you would do well to go back to Rome." To which the other responded: " I am now too far advanced in years to again undertake the journey, but as you are still young, you should go, for you will there learn that things are not exactly as you say."

Sbinko, Archbishop of Prague, had time and again warned Huss to moderate the vigor of his language, but, these friendly admonitions proving fruitless, was eventually obliged to take more decided measures against him.

Wenceslaus, who had been deprived of the German crown to make room for *Rupert* of the Palatinate, whose claims Gregory XII. recognized, now desired to join the *conciliabulum* of Pisa, which promised to declare him King of Rome. But to this the Archbishop of Prague, who, holding Gregory to be the lawful Pope, yielded him a willing obedience, refused to assent, and was supported in his resolution by the action of the university. Huss, on the other hand, being influential at court, and enabled, through his friend Jerome, to interest the higher classes in favor of the project, persuaded King Wenceslaus to pass a law (1409) granting *three* votes at the university to the Bohemian nation and only *one* to the foreign nations, consisting of the Bavarian, Saxon, and Polish, half of the last-named nation being Silesians. These nations, in consequence, immediately quitted Prague, and from this time dates the foundation of the Universities of Leipsic and Rostock, and the augmentation of that of Cracow.[1] The Archbishop, yielding to force, complied with the royal pleasure and attended the Synod of Pisa. His enemies, elated by their success, impeached his orthodoxy at the court of *Alexander V.* The ruse, however, was not successful. Upon the representation of the Archbishop that the disciples of Wickliffe were doing all in their power to disseminate his errors, Alexander V. issued a bull, in 1409, commissioning him to proceed against the heretics, and authorizing him to prohibit preaching outside of parish, collegiate, and conventual churches. The latter clause was a direct blow at Huss, who, being thus threatened in his most efficient agency for sowing the seeds of error, protested against it and against the order of the Archbishop for the burning of Wickliffe's writings. As Huss had appealed to Rome, he was now cited by John XXIII. to appear in person and defend his cause; but, after shuffling about and evading the summons under various flimsy pretexts, he openly refused to obey, and was cut off from the communion of the Church in 1411. Many of his former friends, astonished at seeing him go so far in the advocacy of Wickliffe's teaching as to set at naught the authority of the Church, broke with him once and for all.

---

[1] **Huss' Sermons, translated into German by *Nowotny*, Goerlitz, 1854, three numbers.**

Huss and his friend, Jerome of Prague, now threw-off all pretense of respect for authority. John XXIII. had just published a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, and granted an indulgence to those who should take part in it. So excellent an opportunity to revile the papacy could not be allowed to pass unimproved, and accordingly Huss and Jerome made it the occasion of the most violent and indecent assaults upon papal authority. Jerome led off by arranging a public *disputation, the object of which was to ridicule the bull of indulgences*, after which Huss and himself assailed it in language the most vituperative, and finally consigned it to the flames. In spite of the efforts of his friends at court in his behalf, Huss was for this act expelled the city of Prague. Now an exile, he sought an asylum first with one nobleman and then with another, but was always careful to spread his errors, whenever an opportunity offered, by preaching in the open fields to the people of the neighboring country. It was during this time that he wrote his TRACTATUS DE ECCLESIA, the most important of all his writings, and in its aim, notwithstanding the author's attempts to explain away its most offensive features, entirely subversive of Church government.

---

[1] *Höfler*, Master John Huss, and the departure, in 1409, of the German professors and students from Prague, ibid. 1862.

The *letters* addressed by him, during his absence, to his friends in Prague afforded more abundant evidence of his furious hatred of the Pope and the clergy than anything he had previously written or said. The outrages against the clergy were so violent, and the conduct of the Grubenheimers so notorious and scandalous, that Bohemia came to be popularly spoken of as the land of heretics, though Huss maintained that *no true Bohemian had ever merited so opprobrious an epithet.*

Rome could no longer resist the reiterated and constantly increasing complaints of the clergy, who were, moreover, supported by the powerful influence of the University of Paris, and instructions were accordingly sent to King Wenceslaus and the Archbishop of Prague to put forth every energy in suppressing the growing disorders. The listless monarch, now fully roused to a sense of his duty, sought to preserve the fair fame of his name and country, and was ably assisted in the good work by his step-brother, Sigismund, the heir apparent to the throne. They prevailed upon Huss to go to *Constance*, where the *Council* was then in session, and defend his doctrines—a course, they urged, which could not be objectionable to him, as he had frequently appealed to the verdict of an ecumenical council. Under pretext of protecting him while on his journey, the Emperor provided him with an escort of three Bohemian knights, named John of *Chlum*, Wenzel of *Duba*, and *Lacembok.* He also received a safe-conduct, issued at Spires, October 18, 1414, and he now saw himself, as he expressed it in a letter to Sigismund, obliged "*to bend his neck.*"

After his return to Prague, Huss made public declaration through the inquisitor of the archdiocese of Prague, disclaiming every heresy imputed to him, and public notices were affixed to all the churches and to the royal palace, to the effect that "any one desiring to bring action in matters concerning faith, against John Huss, should present their charges before the Council of Constance." He also published a second notice, declaring that "if he should (previously to the Council) be convicted of any error, or of having taught aught contrary to faith, he would be ready to undergo the punishment of a heretic."[1]

Accompanied by the three knights, a cavalcade of thirty horsemen, and two carriages, Huss set out for Constance, October 11, 1414, where he arrived November 3d, two days before the opening of the Council, and retired to his lodgings to await the Emperor's safe-conduct, which should have been forwarded from Spires in time to reach him on his arrival at Constance.[2] Huss was thus doubly secured, having, besides the *protection* afforded by the three knights, the *written* safe-conduct of the Emperor. To provide against any inconvenience arising from ecclesiastical restriction, Pope John XXIII. removed from him, temporarily, the sentence of excommunication, gave him leave to live in a private house, to go about freely, and to visit the churches, putting no further restraint upon him than the inhibition to either say Mass or preach.

His two accusers, *Michael de Causis* and *Stephen Palecz*, both Bohemians, in the meantime had, by putting together numerous extracts from his writings, drawn up a formal indictment of heresy against him, which they laid before the Pope and the Council. It was thought necessary, pending the ecclesiastical trial, not to expose Huss to external influence, and he was accordingly, on the 28th of November, placed in honorable confinement in the residence of a canon of Constance, whence he was transferred, in January, 1415, to a Dominican convent situated on the shores of the Lake of Constance. Apart from this precaution, which it was thought proper to employ under the circumstances, Huss had really exposed himself to such treatment by an utter disregard of the inhibition to say Mass and preach; but that his confinement was far from being rigorous is amply shown by the fact that he composed in the interval many theological treatises, maintained an active correspondence with his friends in the city and at a distance; and in his letters freely advocated and discussed his erroneous tenets, and frequently animadverted with acrimonious severity upon the action of the Council, and the motives of those who had brought charges against him.[1]

---

[1] Porro, si me de errore aliquo convicerit, et me aliena a fide docuisse probaverit, non recusabo, *quascunque haeretici poenas ferre* (acta Hussii, fol. 2). But, for all this, Huss addressed the Emperor in the Council as follows: "May your Gracious Highness know that I came here *freely*, not to defend anything stubbornly, but to amend, if I am taught better."

[2] For the original text, see *Hefele* VII. 1, p. 221, and *Berger*, p. 179 sq., who bring forward many similar letters of safe-conduct, which they briefly review.

John XXIII. fled from Constance, March 21st, and as this event inspired Huss and his friends with hopes of securing his freedom, and in this way his escape from the city, he was removed, on the morning of March 22d, from the Dominican convent to the castle of Gottlieben, where his confinement was more rigid. The Knight of Chlum protested that in virtue of the safe-conduct granted Huss, he had a right to his freedom *at least until* such time as *the trial* should open; and the Emperor Sigismund was also inclined to favor this opinion, but being informed that Huss had violated his promise, and that the Council insisted on its right to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction after the established form, he withdrew his objections. To conduct a *trial of this kind publicly*, would have been a deviation from precedent and established usage; but though strangers were excluded, Huss himself was treated with mildness and consideration. *Peter d'Ailly* and *Zabarella* served on the commission that conducted the process. A most careful and searching investigation was opened; the witnesses were sworn and examined in presence of the accused; and their depositions, together with the acts of a former trial, formed the basis of the judgment to be rendered. Huss had promised to submit to the decision of the Council, and in the early stage of the proceedings it seemed that he would hold to his word; but his sensitive and morbid pride for the fair name of Bohemia and its people, who, he professed to believe, had never been tainted with error, forbade him to make the sacrifice.[1]

---

[1] After his second audience before the Council, he wrote to his friends in Constance: "They cry out, nearly all of them, like the Jews against our Master, Christ." This was after he had been led back to prison. Opp. I., fol. 69, 2; ep. 36. (Tr.)

The forty-five propositions of Wickliffe had been condemned by the Council, in its eighth session, held May 4th, and in the early part of June, Huss was notified to prepare for *public* trial, *which had been granted him chiefly through the persistent efforts of the Emperor Sigismund.* Huss had three public hearings before the Council, in the general congregations held respectively on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of June. He steadfastly refused to retract the propositions imputed to him, declaring that some of them he had never taught; that others were distorted and proposed in a perverse sense; and that he was prepared to discuss such as he really held, and would abjure only when "texts of Scripture subversive of them" should have been adduced. In the second general congregation the Emperor, who was present, frequently interrupted the order of the proceedings, and took occasion to tell Huss, when the latter had refused to recant anything, that the letter of *safe-conduct* could in no wise interfere with the verdict of the Council. "*I have redeemed my promise,*" the Emperor continued; "*if you obstinately persist in defending your errors, the Council has its rights and laws, according to which it must proceed against you. As for myself, I had rather prepare with my own hands the fagots for your burning than protect your errors.* I therefore advise you to submit to the decision of the Council, and the sooner you do it the better." In the third general congregation a form of recantation was proposed to him, in which he was required to say that he "*abjured his errors,*" but this he refused to take, and he also stubbornly repelled other and well-meant efforts on the part of the bishops and the Emperor to bring about a reconciliation. It was intended, had he recanted, to place him in honorable custody, and to deal with him as Abelard had been dealt with in a former age. This was also the course proposed by the Emperor, who, growing indignant at Huss' obstinacy, but still more at his assertion that those in authority ceased to have jurisdiction while in mortal sin,[1] now abandoned him altogether. He also stated that heretofore he had been in no condition to form a correct opinion of the Hussite movement, but that he could now say "*there never was a more mischievous heretic than Huss.*"[2] After every attempt to induce him to retract his errors had failed, he was, on July 6th, brought before the *fifteenth general session* of the Council, held in the cathedral of Constance, to receive judgment. Thirty propositions, drawn chiefly from his *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, were condemned, of which the following are the most remarkable:

---

[1] Cf. *Schwab*, John Gerson, pp. 592, 593.

1. The members of the *Church* consist wholly of the *praedestinati*, or of those predestined to everlasting happiness, who can no more cease to be of her fold than the *praesciti*, or those foredoomed to eternal misery, can enter it. 2. There is no Head of the Church other than Christ; and to say *either that the Church militant has need of a visible head*, or that Christ instituted such, is to assert what can not be proved. 3. The *papacy* owes its origin solely to *imperial favor and authority*. 4. *The claim of the Church to the obedience* of her members *is a pure invention of priests*, and contrary to Holy Scripture. Hence, 5. When the conscience of a priest bears witness to his purity of motive and uprightness, he should not be deterred from preaching by papal injunction or frightened by sentence of excommunication. 6. But, on the other hand, *any one invested with either temporal or spiritual authority, when satisfied by the witness of his conscience that he is in mortal sin, in that moment loses all power and jurisdiction* over Christian people, and must lay down his office. 7. *Holy Scripture* is the *sole* source and rule of Christian faith, a doctrine which Wickliffe also taught. ◆ The teaching of Huss *on the Blessed Eucharist* seems to have been orthodox; and neither was he the author of *Utraquism* or the receiving of the Eucharist under both species. He also admitted *seven* sacraments, taught that veneration should be paid to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and stoutly defended the celibacy of the clergy.[3]

---

[1] "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est praelatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali," in *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 755. The Council, in its fifteenth session, condemned also the following propositions as heretical: "Quilibet tyrannus potest et debet licite et meritorie occidi per quemcunque vassallum suum vel subditum, etiam per clanculares insidias, et subtiles blanditias vel adulationes, non obstante quocumque praestito juramento, seu confoederatione factis cum eo, non exspectata sententia vel mandato judicis cujuscumque. See *Balmes*, Prot. comp. with Cath. Ch. LVI. (Tr.)

[2] In *Höfler*, Vol. I., p. 257.

[3] In *Mansi*, T. XXVII., pp. 754, 755. Cf. †*Cappenberg*, Utrum Hussii doctrina fuerit haeretica et merito ab ecclesia catholica anathemate proscripta nec ne? Monast. 1834. †*Friedrich*, The Doctrine of John Huss, etc., Ratisb. 1862. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 158 sq. and p. 194–206.

The duty of the Council under the circumstances was plain; it condemned these doctrines as heretical and dangerous, and it could not have done less. As a consequence the works of Huss were ordered to be burnt. The Council after having deposed and degraded him (July 6th), had no further jurisdiction over him, and transferred him to the *civil* authorities, with the prayer, which the Church had used on such occasions for centuries, "that his life be spared, and he be condemned to perpetual imprisonment."[1] By the laws of the Empire one convicted of heresy, in that age a *civil* offense, and refusing to abjure, was to be punished with death; and hence, unless an exception were made in Huss' case, he too must undergo the penalty. But apart from the offense of heresy, Huss had been guilty of serious crimes against civil society. He had written libelous documents, made inflammatory speeches, stirred up the people to revolt, given any subject permission to take the life of a tyrant, and made such subject the judge as to what acts properly constituted tyranny in a ruler.[2] Hence, Huss was by his own acts putting heresy out of the question, within the competence of the civil authority which he sought to undermine and subvert, and it was simply the duty of the latter to protect itself against so furious and dangerous an agitator.

As *Leo* justly remarks, "Others have indeed preached doctrines more bold and aggressive than those of Huss, and followed out in practice what they held in theory, but in doing so, they observed the rules proper to such occasions, and not one of them was ever sent to the stake." Did not *St. Peter Damian* and *St. Bernard*, *Petrarca*, *St. Catharine of Siena*, and *St. Bridget* portray the abuses and disorders of the Church, in language the most fiery and energetic, and demand their reformation in terms the most stern and uncompromising, and was not one of these outspoken reformers, St. Bridget, placed upon the roll of Saints, by the very Council that condemned the doctrines of Huss?

---

[1] In *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 753, it is said: "Sancta Synodus Joannem Hus, attento, quod ecclesia Dei non habeat ultra, quid gerere valeat (quam) *judicio saeculari relinquere:* ipsum curiae saeculari relinquendum fore decernit." Cf. *John von Müller*, Annot. to his Hist. of Switzerland, Bk. III., ch. 2, nro. 6; and *Schmidt*, Hist. of the Germans, Pt. IV., p. 124.

[2] See proposition, above on p. 960, n. 1, condemned by the Council. (Tr.)

The Church distinguishes, by a kind of Divine instinct, the true reformer from the false; reprobates the one and holds the other in honor. "If," says *Moehler*,[1] "one be deeply versed in Divine and eternal truths and give unmistakable proof that his life is of a piece with his teachings; if, above all things, he be not self-sufficient, and, therefore, ready to *begin by reforming himself;* if, finally, he bring experience to the support of his views, and prove by his practice his faith in his own advice, then will the Church gladly and thankfully recognize not only his right, but his duty to widen the sphere of his labors, to correct the morals and revive the zeal of the faithful. But if these conditions be absent, if he have nothing better to offer than beautiful but impracticable theories and fine words, then will he be dismissed with merited contempt, and told to go his way." Such was Huss. According to the penalty prescribed by the *civil legislation* of that age, he was burnt at the stake (July 6, 1415), and bore his sufferings with a courage and fortitude worthy of a better cause.[2]

The scope and force of the letter of *safe-conduct* issued to Huss, have been greatly misapprehended, and the Emperor Sigismund,[3] in consequence, reproached with violating his word. To form a correct estimate of its character, it will be necessary, besides bearing in mind what has been said above, to examine the letter itself. By the safe-conduct, Huss was taken under the protection of the Empire, and commended to officials and all subjects whether spiritual or lay; all are commanded to receive and treat him kindly, and in every way facilitate his progress; he is permitted *to go to and fro* freely where he likes, and, if need be, to have a guard for his protection. The letter was in effect a passport, intended to remove the real or simulated fear of Huss in traveling through Germany, both on his way to and return from Constance, should he be acquitted; but neither he himself nor his friends ever thought of its protecting him against the action of the Council, the supreme ecclesiastical court of judicature.

---

[1] Miscellanea, Vol. II., p. 25.

[2] Cf. below, the section on the Inquisition, and punishment of heretics.

[3] Conf. *v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., p. 12 sq. and p. 495–497. See above, p. 957 n. 2.

To entertain so strange a notion would be to render the proceedings of the Council, to whose decision he expressed his willingness to submit until it was evident the decision would be adverse, in the highest degree farcical. Even the *Bohemian nobles,* in the memorial addressed to the Council after he had been imprisoned, claimed only that in virtue of the letter of safe-conduct he was entitled to a *public* hearing and should be allowed to explain his doctrine. They indeed admitted, that "if he were found guilty according to law and by legal procedure, he should be punished as he deserved." And in the vehement and denunciatory address sent to the Council, after the execution, these same Bohemian nobles, so devoted to the memory of Huss, did not by word or syllable intimate that the safe-conduct[1] had been violated, which they certainly would have done had there been the slightest infraction of it. Neither do the words of the Emperor *Sigismund,* already given and again repeated, in reply to the King of Aragon, who had written for information on the point, in which he stated that *a safe-conduct could not exempt one from deserved punishment,*[2] imply that any promise of exemption was contained in the letter. The Council understood the safe-conduct in precisely the same sense as the one issued by itself to *John XXIII.* and *Jerome of Prague,* in each of which it was stated that its bearer should be protected against unlawful violence, but not against the judgment of a competent tribunal of justice. It is therefore unjust and dishonest to accuse the Council, as *Gieseler*[3] has done, of having, in order to clear the Emperor of the imputation of violating a safe-conduct issued by himself, enacted a decree declaring that no faith was to be kept with a heretic. This decree, given by Gieseler in an abbreviated form, but in full in the foot-note below,[1] declares *first*, that the Church enjoys in all spiritual matters, such as heresy, an inherent and wholly independent jurisdiction, and that such jurisdiction being within her competency, she can not be restrained in the exercise of it by any general principle or special enactment, such as the granting of a safe-conduct, of civil authority; *second*, that, when a prince promises to protect any one, *he is bound to keep to the strict letter of his word*, unless, by so doing, he would violate the right of another—that is, *he is positively bound by his promise, and must make it good in so far as he has power to do so*—a sense quite the reverse of what has been ascribed to this decree of the Council. Again, the dramatic scene of Huss pitching away the safe-conduct after his condemnation, and the Emperor's blushing,[2] is a *later* fabrication of the Czechs intended to feed the imaginations of the people. *Mladenowicz*, secretary to the Knight of Chlum, the disciple and biographer of Huss, who, had the incident occurred, would have been an eye-witness of it, and would not surely have omitted it, makes no mention of it.[3]

---

[1] *Histor. Polit. Papers,* Vol. IV., p. 420–425: "John Huss and his letter of Safe-conduct," and in *Helfert,* p. 199.

[2] See *Hefele,* l. c., p. 114.

[3] *Gieseler,* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 418; the *Catholic* doctrine on the point in question is quite the reverse of this, and explained well in *Holden,* Analysis fidei, c. 9 (*Braun,* Bibl. regul. fidei, T. II.).

---

[1] *Praesens St. Synodus* ex quovis salvo conductu, per Imperatorem, reges et alios saeculi Principes haereticis vel de haeresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo se adstrinxerint, concesso, nullum fidei catholicae, vel jurisdictioni ecclesiasticae praejudicium generari, vel impedimentum praestari posse sive debere declarat: quominus salvo dicto conductu non obstante liceat judici competenti ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eas debite procedere, easdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos pertinaciter recusaverint revocare errores, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi: nec sic promittentem, *cum alias fecerit quod in ipso* est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum. In *v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., p. 521. Another decree, which the Protestant *v. d. Hardt* found in the codex Dorrianus, and *first* published, has the following: "Quum tamen Joan. Huss fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter compugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum, nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino vel humano fuerit in praejudicium catholicae fidei observanda." From *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* reasons, it is evident that this decree is apocryphal. The signatures invariably affixed to the other decrees are wanting to this, and it seems to have been specially designed to admit of the malicious interpretation that a promise may be given to a heretic *without the least intention of keeping it.*

[2] This is so stated by *v. d. Hardt*, Vol. IV., p. 393: "Haec cum loqueretur, oculos in imperatorem defixos habuit. Ille vero statim vehementer erubuit, atque ejus verecundus tinxerat ora rubor." Transl. from *Neander's* Ch. Hist., Engl. tr., Vol. V., p. 369.

[3] Cf. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 254–283.

Jerome of Prague, the restless and inconsistent friend of Huss, the philosopher, theologian, and man of the world, was more generally known, and exerted a wider influence than the latter. He acquired a great reputation as a *reformer* among all classes in distant and widely different countries, but chiefly in Bohemia and Moravia. At the universities of Heidelberg, Paris, and other cities, he created much disturbance by his skillful defense and ardent advocacy of the doctrines of Wickliffe. He was arrested and brought to trial at Vienna, for exciting commotions, but escaped by making false representations to the magistrates.[1] In 1410 he appeared at Ofen, before the Emperor, who, on the complaint of Archbishop Sbinko of Prague, had him placed under arrest and handed over to the Archbishop of Gran, by whom he was immediately set at liberty. We hear of him again at Prague, which he quitted after the commotions of 1413, paid a visit to King Wladislaus of Poland and Witold, Duke of Lithuania, and sought to persuade the latter to apostatize to the Greek Church. He remained some time at Cracow, and as usual disturbed the public peace.

Returning again to Prague, he learned the imprisonment of his friend Huss, and resolving to be near him him, arrived secretly, and in disguise, at Constance, April 4, 1415, whence he went next day to the small town of Ueberlingen, four miles distant.

From this place he issued a public notice stating that if permission were given him to come to Constance and quit it again unmolested, he would answer to any charge of heresy that might be brought against him. Having been denied this he obtained from the Bohemian knights, residing in Constance, an ample vindication of his course, and set out on his way to Bohemia. The Council, in reply to the public notice of Jerome, published an edict summoning him to appear before that body and defend his doctrine in public session.

Meanwhile, Jerome was arrested at Hirschau in Suabia. He secured a safe-conduct protecting his person in every way consistent with justice.[1] On May 23, 1415, he had his first audience of the Council, which, owing to the indignation of the Bohemian knights at the arrest and imprisonment of himself and Huss, was disposed to treat him kindly, and to make every concession consistent with his conduct, to bring him to retract his errors. To the various charges brought against him, he replied, like Huss, that he was prepared to abjure them when he should have been taught better. He was delivered to the Archbishop of Riga, and again conducted to prison, whence he was brought a second time before the Council, and, after a number of audiences, finally consented to read a prescribed form of recantation, in the nineteenth session, held September 23, 1415, by which he abjured the heresies of Wickliffe and Huss, together with other errors he himself had taught. Having done all that was required of him, he demanded to be set at liberty, and the commission appointed to try him, headed by Cardinal d'Ailly, acknowledged the justness of the demand; but Palecz, Michael de Causis, and some monks who had come on from Prague, suspicious of his motives, and persuaded that he would at once return to Bohemia and raise fresh disturbances, protested against allowing him to be set at liberty. Jerome had also, in conversation with his friends and others, let fall some expressions which gave color to the suspicions of his enemies. But the commission which had acted solely upon the evidence brought forward during the trial, and could take no account of hearsay, offended that its action had been ignored, at once resigned, and refused to have anything more to do in the matter. When the second commission had been appointed, Jerome, refusing to submit to a private examination, demanded a public audience, which was granted him May 23, 1416. He was required to take an oath to speak the truth, which he declined doing because he did not recognize the authority of the new commission, though it had been appointed by the Council, and had precisely the same sanction as the former one. He was again before the Council on the 27th of May, when he spoke in his own defense, attributing his persecution to the malignity of a corrupt and worldly minded clergy, who, he said, had been instrumental in putting to death all the great martyrs the world had ever seen; and then reverting to his former recantation, said he wished to withdraw whatever he had said against either Wickliffe or Huss and their teachings; praised the latter in the most extravagant terms, and finally turning to his judges summoned them to appear before him on the day of Great Assizes. Forty days were granted him to reconsider his step, and during the interval he was visited by many of the more prominent and holy members of the Council, among whom was Cardinal Zabarella, who used every means that charity and zeal could suggest to prevail upon him to retract, but to no purpose. The Council pronounced sentence upon him May 30th, after which he was handed over to the civil power, and was burnt at the stake, "enduring the torments of fire," says Poggio, an eye-witness, "with more tranquillity than was displayed by Socrates in drinking the cup of hemlock."[1]

---

[1] *Von der Hardt*, 638. (Tr.)

---

[1] Ad quod a violentia, justitia semper salva, omnem tibi salvum conductum nostrum quantum in nobis est et fides exigit orthodoxa, tenore praesentium offerimus. Opp. II., f. 350, 351. (Tr.)

THE HUSSITE WARS.

Shortly after the departure of Huss and his friend, Jerome of Prague, from the Bohemian capital, *Jacob of Mies*, called Jocobellus on account of his diminutive stature, who had been a professor of philosophy since the year 1400, started, toward the close of the year 1414, the question of Communion under both kinds, maintaining that it was *absolutely necessary* the laity should so receive. In this he went beyond the teaching of Huss, who, while favoring the innovation, desired to introduce it *only with the approbation of the Church.* The practice, which was called *Utraquism*, became the distinctive characteristic of the Hussites, and was embraced by the great bulk of the nobility. To prevent any misapprehension as to the mind of the Church on this question, the Council of Constance, in its thirteenth session, held June 15, 1415, prohibited the administration of the chalice to the laity, and condemned the practice as leading to error.[1] In the meantime, the news of Huss' execution had reached Prague, and its effect upon his partisans was to call forth the most inflammatory denunciations of the act and to raise their indignation to the highest degree.[2] Headed by *Nicholas of Hussinecz* and *John Ziska*, both chamberlains of King Wenceslaus, they resolved to maintain by force and violence the use of the Chalice among the laity. Revolt and anarchy everywhere succeeded to law and order. The new doctrine, which spread rapidly, produced everywhere the same results. A mob of its most enthusiastic advocates marched in procession through the streets of Prague, and, halting before the Senate Hall, forced their way into the building, and, seizing seven of the senators, dashed them headlong out of the window. Nor was this all. Churches and convents were sacked and plundered, and uncouth boors strutted through the city decked out in the rich and costly silk-stuffs thus sacrilegiously obtained.

---

[1] *Von der Hardt*, T. III., p. 70. Cf. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 254–283.

It at last occurred to the imbecile King Wenceslaus that perhaps it would be just as well to put a stop to these excesses; but, to his astonishment, those who had profaned churches and convents under pretext of zeal in the most sacred of causes, were irreverent enough to withstand even royalty itself. He and those of the monks and priests who opposed Huss barely escaped with their lives by precipitate flight.

In 1419, Nicholas founded on Mount *Hardisstin*, forty-nine miles south-southeast of Prague, the city and fortress of *Tabor*, and gave Communion under both kinds to forty thousand persons. The Calixtines, or the more moderate of the sectaries, had their headquarters in Prague.

---

[1] *Conc. Constant.* decretum contra communion. sub utraque specie panis et vini (*v. d. Hardt*, T. III., p. 646; T. IV., p. 333. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 381 sq. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., 727 sq.) It is said here of the use of the chalice: "Laudabilem ecclesiae consuetudinem (sub una specie) rationabiliter approbatam (cf. Vol. I., p. 721, and below, § 293, note *) tanquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur." — The Council, on the contrary, says: "Et sicut haec consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen postea a conficientibus sub utraque et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, cum *firmissime credendum sit* et nullatenus dubitandum, *integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri.* Unde quum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et SS. Patribus (especially the schoolmen) rationabiliter introducta et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut *sine ecclesiae auctoritate* pro libito mutare."

[2] *Theobald*, Hussite war, 3 ed. 1750, 3 vols. 4to.

The indignation and grief caused by these events hastened the death of King Wenceslaus, August 16, 1419. He was succeeded in the government of Bohemia and Moravia by *Sigismund*, to whom the Calixtines consented, and the Taborites refused to take the oath of allegiance. The latter flew to arms, and, threatening the city of Prague, forced it to participate in their revolt. Sigismund now marched against them with an army of fifty thousand men and a considerable auxiliary force of crusaders, raised by the publication of the bull of Pope Martin, but his efforts were vain against the fanatical zeal of the Hussites. His throne was even declared forfeit (November, 1420).

Ziska, who became their sole leader on the death of Hussinecz, arrogantly demanded the concession of the *four following articles:* 1. The word of God shall be freely preached throughout the kingdom; 2. Communion under both kinds shall be given to all who demand it and are not burdened with mortal sin ; 3. The clergy shall give up all property and secular pursuits, and live as did the Apostles; 4. Mortal sin, in either cleric or layman, shall be punished by the civil tribunal. Under the head of mortal sin were comprised drunkenness, theft, the wearing of the tonsure, and the receiving of stipends for Masses.

These articles being rejected by the Emperor, the Hussites resolved upon a desperate resistance. They devastated the country far and wide, and kindled afresh the fires of civil war. In 1421, a second army of crusaders entered Bohemia. A great battle was fought at Naby, in which Ziska, already blind of an eye, lost his second, but succeeded, notwithstanding this untoward accident, in dispersing the crusaders and completely routing the superior army of Sigismund. When the Calixtines of Prague made an offer of the crown to three different foreigners, Ziska threatened to destroy the city if they attempted to carry out this proposal, and was only deterred from making good his threat by the influence of the

Hussite theologian, *Rokyczana*, who effected a temporary reconciliation between the parties. Ziska died shortly after (October 12, 1424), and the Hussites, no longer held together by his powerful will, split into four conflicting parties—divided, however, more by political than religious differences. There were the *Taborites*, under *Procope the Elder;* the *Orphans*, under *Procope the Younger;* the *Horebites*, and the *Calixtines* of Prague. Each fought fiercely against the other, and all made incursions into the neighboring countries. They invaded Saxony, the March of Brandenburg, and Silesia, and menaced the cities of Vienna and Ratisbon. The crusaders sent against them in 1427 and 1431 were as unsuccessful as their predecessors had been.

When the ruinous and fruitless war had gone on for years, the *Council of Basle* considerately interposed and invited the Hussites to a conference (1433), but the latter, when told that the four articles could not be granted without limitations,[1] withdrew, having accomplished nothing. Another conference followed, at which an agreement was entered into, known as the *Compact of Basle.* By this was granted to the Hussites—1. That the word of God should be freely preached, but under the immediate authority of the bishop; 2. That mortal sin should be punished, but by a competent tribunal; 3. That communion under both kinds should be given only to those who had arrived at the age of discretion and earnestly desired it, and who also firmly believed that Christ was received whole and entire (*integer et totus Christus*), under *either* kind, and this the clergy were enjoined to bring frequently before the minds of the people, "for," as the canon goes on to say, "though the Church did, for weighty reasons, suspend the usage of giving *the Chalice to the laity*, *she may*, as in the present case, *restore it again;*" 4. Finally, that the clergy, while continuing to hold benefices, should apply the revenues to the purposes specified in the canons.[1] The *Calixtines* accepted and the *Taborites* rejected the compact. Again an appeal was made to arms, and at the battle of *Böhmischbrod* (May 30, 1434), the Taborites and the Orphans, under the elder and younger Procopes, suffered a disastrous defeat. They submitted, in the following year, to King Sigismund, and in 1436 the treaty or *Compact of Iglau* was signed, extending to all the Hussites the concessions of the *Compact of Basle.* This brought peace to the State, but not to the Church.

---

[1] It is highly important to consult the four discourses delivered in the Council on this article: *Joan. de Ragusa*, De communione sub utraque specie; *Aegidius Carelarius*, De corrigendis publicis peccatoribus; *Henr. Kalteisen*, De libera praedicatione Verbi Dei; *Joan. Polemar*, De civili dominio clericorum. (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1655–1950; *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 699–1168.

On the one hand, the Calixtines, now called *Utraquists,* were jealous of their rights and vigilant in their maintenance; while, on the other, the Catholics were desirous of restoring *uniformity* in divine worship, and anxious to abolish an exceptional usage. Both parties being thus sensitively suspicious of each other, and the one ready to repel the most distant invasion of its rights by the other, frequent collisions were inevitable. The efforts of the eloquent and holy *John Capistrano,* an angel of peace in human guise, sent by Pope *Nicholas V.* to preach forgiveness and unity, were of no avail. The extreme Hussites receded daily farther and farther from the Church, and ended by becoming petty sectaries, known as the *Bohemian and Moravian Brethren,*[2] and were persecuted by Calixtines and orthodox Catholics alike. A fresh lease of life was given them by the breaking out of the Reformation in Germany.

§ 281. *German Theology.*

Among those writers who flourished during the present epoch, and were the authors of heretical opinions which exercised a marked influence on their own and succeeding generations of men, and notably on *Luther,* the author of a small *ascetical* work containing fifty-four chapters, holds a distinguished place. From Luther this work received the title of "*German Theology*."[1] Its author lived probably in the fifteenth century, and it is more than likely was a member of the society of mystics known as the *Friends of God*, or Brethren of the Common Life. Having a decided tendency to speculation, and, as his work evinces, possessing a penetrating intellect and a deeply religious mind, he nevertheless frequently loses sight of Christian principles and ideas, indulges in the pantheistic language of *Tauler*, and, if one may judge from numerous utterances of *very doubtful and insidious import*, was in close sympathy with the opinions of *Master Eckhart*.[2] The *idea of God* he makes synonymous with the *idea of goodness*, thus drifting toward *pantheism*.. The underlying and pervading idea of the *German Theology*, brought out in endless variety of expression, resolves itself into the formula: "*God is all in all, and besides Him there is nothing*." Connected with this idea is the *dualistic* principle that the natural and supernatural elements in man are ceaselessly warring against each other in irreconcilable antagonism. Holding not only that the *finite* is void, a negation, but also that it is *purposeless* and *sinful*, he goes on to infer a *dual being*—that is, one that is or exists, the simple act of being; and a complex state of being in which a *will* is united to the simple act, thus forming the *individual being, which exists for itself*. The first kind of *being*, he says, is essentially *divine*, essentially *good*. To love, to wish, or to desire aught besides God, is, he says, all one with sinning; for as such acts are not *His being, it therefore follows that they are the reverse of good.* Hence the further deduction that personal and free-will must be stifled, and that to wholly renounce one's freedom is the beginning of a Christian life. *To God alone belongs the prerogative of willing and acting, and it is man's duty to remain quiescent and suffer God to will and act through him. In this way will man be "deified."* The better to insure this passive state, he highly recommends abstinence from whatever may stir and rouse into activity the mental energies, such, for instance, as study and the cultivation of science, as understood by the degenerate Schoolmen.[1] He, like other mystical writers, distinguishes *three* stages in the process of "*deification*,"—viz., purification, illumination, and union with God. The characteristic of the highest stage is a pure and *disinterested love* embracing all things as a unit, that is, "One in all, and all in one." (Ch. 46).

---

[1] The acts of these negotiations are in *Martène,* Amplissima Collectio, T. VIII., p. 596 sq., and in *Mansi,* T. XXX., pp. 590, 634, 688, and 692.

[2] Cf. *Bossuet,* Hist. des variations, liv. II., §168 sq.; *Lochner,* Origin and first destiny of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, Nürnberg, 1832; *Gindely,* Hist. of the Bohemian Brethren (1457–1671), Prague, 1857 sq., 2 vols.

---

[1] Luther published the *German Theology* in 1516, believing it to be composed of selections from the works of Tauler. In the preface which he wrote for the volume he says: "This admirable little work, though lacking in worldly wisdom and destitute of literary grace, is all the more precious in that it breathes a divine wisdom and exhibits a heavenly art. And, if I may be permitted to bring my old fool again into prominence, I will say that I do not hesitate to place beside *the Bible and St. Augustine* a work from which I have learned more concerning God, Christ, man, and in fact everything else, than from any other. Now do I fully comprehend, for the first time, how unjust are the many learned men who reproach us Wittenberg theologians with attempting to put forth something new, as if there did not exist in other times and countries as able men as in our own." There have been many editions of the German Theology in recent times, among which may be mentioned those of *Grell*, Berlin, 1817; *Krüger*, Lemgo, 1822; *Detzer*, Erlangen, 1827; *Troxler*, St. Gall, 1837; *Pfeiffer*, Stuttg. 1851 (from the only *manuscript*, known to the present day, of 1497), 2 ed. 1855.

[2] See page 679.

Were the many *characteristic* remarks of this work, which was intended solely *to edify*, and is in several respects very like the *Following of Christ*, taken in connection with the context in which they are found, they would be far less objectionable than they seem when standing isolated.

The work is also much more offensive in the *Latin translation* than in the *original.* It is entirely owing to Luther's misrepresentations of its true drift and meaning that it ever came to be placed on the index of prohibited books.

§ 282. *The Heretics, John Wesel and John van Goch; and the Zealots, John Wessel and Jerome Savanorola.*[2]

I. *John Wesel*, whose family name was Ruchrath or Richrath, but who took his new name from the place of his birth, the Upper-Wesel, near St. Goar, on the Rhine, was in the early part of his career professor of theology at Erfurt, and afterward preacher at Mentz and Worms. While at Erfurt he had written a work entitled *Adv. Indulgentias*, in which he renounced the accepted doctrine; and, after receiving his appointment as preacher, again took occasion to assail indulgences, and spread his anti-ecclesiastical and heretical teachings. The universities of Cologne and Heidelberg had rendered judgment unfavorable to his teachings, and he was in consequence, brought before the Inquisition at Mentz (1479), and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in the Augustinian convent of that city, where he died two years later. He, however, retracted his errors, adding: "I bow to the Holy Catholic Church; I accept the advice of the doctors, and humbly sue for pardon." The following are some of his proscribed propositions: It belongs to Christ alone to expound the Scriptures; all other expositions are faulty and incorrect. The names of the elect of God are written in the Book of Life from all eternity; as no excommunication can erase them, so neither can Pope, bishop, nor indulgences be of any service to these souls in working out their salvation. The commandments of the Church do not bind under sin. Christ may be present in the Eucharist without change of the substance of bread. Peter, said he, did indeed celebrate Mass by command of Our Lord, but since his time the liturgy has become so complex and lengthy that it is now a burden to all Christians. I hold, he added, the Pope, the Church, and the councils in the utmost contempt, and do not believe that Christ ever prescribed fasts, pilgrimages, or any prayer other than the Our Father.[1]

---

[1] *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 654–666. Against this **Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. X., p. 875–884; French transl., Vol. 23, p. 324–336. *Stoeckl*, Vol. II., p. 1149–1159. *Reifenrath*, The German Theology of the Frankfort Friend of God, Halle, 1863.

[2] Concerning them, conf. *Schroeckh*, Christian Ch. Hist., Pt. XXXIII., p. 278–298, and p. 543–586. *Muurling*, Comm. de Wessel. Gansf. cum vita tum meritis etc., Traj., Pars I., 1831; and *Ullmann*, Reformers before the Reforma-

II. *John* (Pupper) *van Goch*, a native of the Netherlands, and prior of a nunnery at Malines († 1456), asserted that those doctrines alone were true which were drawn from, and had

---

tion, especially in Germany and the Netherlands, Hamburg, 1841–42, 2 vols.; the second volume is at the same time the second thoroughly revised edition of the work, *John Wessel*, a forerunner of Luther's, Hamburg, 1834.

[1] His work, Adversus indulgentias, and De auctoritate, officio et potestate Pastorum eccl. (*Walch*, Monum. medii aevi, fasc. I. and II.) "Paradoxes of Dr. John of Wesel," in the Fasciculus rerum expetendarum. The acts of his trial, in *Argentré*, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus ab initio, saec. XII., T. I., Pt. II., p. 291 sq.

their warrant in the canonical books of Holy Writ. He said that the purity and truth[1] of Christianity had in every age been disfigured by error, a defect which it was his mission to correct. The Mosaic Law, he added, was the first blot on Christianity, to which succeeded the erroneous doctrine that Christian life consists partially in faith without works. Moreover, Pelagius had eliminated supernatural grace from the Christian scheme, and *vows* had been declared essential to Christian perfection, an error introduced by the Thomists, to which he opposed nine conclusions, favoring a wider freedom in Christian religion.

III. *John Wessel*, whom *Ullmann* has erroneously called the forerunner of Luther, was born at Groeningen, in 1419. In early life he attended the school of the *Brothers of the Common Life*, at Zwoll, where he was under the influence of Thomas à Kempis. After having acquired here the rudiments of education he went to Cologne, where he studied Greek and Roman classical literature, Hebrew and theology, and after completing his course took a professor's chair. Throwing up his professorship after a time, he visited successively Paris, Italy, and Rome. His admirers, who regarded him as a marvel of humanistic learning and scholastic erudition, and an able advocate of Nominalism, which he had substituted for his earlier Realism, surnamed him the *Light of the World* (*Lux mundi*); while his adversaries, who were at a loss to account for his opposition to many of the current theological views and prevalent vices of the age, called him the *Master of Contradictions* (*Magister Contradictionum*). After making long and laborious journeys in pursuit of knowledge, he returned home, resolved to remain at rest and devote the remainder of his days to study and literary pursuits, and in preparation for a happy death. He devoted much of his time to prayer and meditation in many of the *monasteries* of Holland, and finally closed his life in 1489.

With regard to the specific doctrines of Luther concerning the fall of man; the denial of free-will; the inability of the Pagans either to know or put in practice Christian truth;

---

[1] De libertate christ. ed. *C. Grapheus*, Antverp. 1521, 4to; de quatuor erroribus dialogus. (*Walch*, l. c., fasc. IV., p. 73 sq.; cf. Walchii praef., p. xiii. sq.)

justification by faith, denial of papal supremacy, and others, Wessel, instead of being his forerunner, was quite the reverse. *John Faber*, subsequently Bishop of Vienna, had time and again denied (1528) any sympathy between the two, and *Friedrich*, by careful and elaborate investigation of the writings of Wessel,[1] has shown beyond all manner of doubt that they were as far apart in teaching as pole from pole. The stubborn persistence of Protestants in affirming the contrary must be ascribed either to ignorance of his writings or to a willful perversion of the obvious meaning of his words, and a misapprehension of the opposition which he drew upon himself in the earlier period of his life.[2]

IV. *Jerome Savonarola*, that severe censor of morals, deserves a place here because of his vehement denunciation of *Alexander VI.* Born of a noble family at Ferrara, September 21, 1452, and having completed his philosophical and theological studies, he withdrew from the world, and entered the Dominican Order at Bologna in 1474. He here gave lectures on philosophy, and applied himself to the study of the Fathers, particularly Cassian, Jerome, and Augustine, and of the Holy Scriptures. He commenced his career as a preacher in 1482, and though his first attempts were signal failures, his earnestness and zeal gradually overcame his defects or caused them to be lost sight of, and the success of his subsequent efforts elicited general admiration and applause. When called to Florence to fill the pulpit of St. Mark's, he devoted a portion of his time to the composition of a pamphlet "*On the Government of Florence*," which, together with his *apocalyptical* discourses, had the effect of exciting the Florentines to revolt against the Medici, whose representative, Lorenzo the Magnificent, the great preacher is said to have irritated on his death-bed by demanding that the ancient republican constitution of Florence should be restored. Lorenzo was so indignant that he turned his head away, not deigning to give an answer. But Savonarola's most fierce and violent denunciations were hurled against Pope Alexander VI., against bishops and monks, the pagan tendency of the humanists, and the extravagance and refined profligacy everywhere manifest.

---

[1] Cf. against Ullmann's false statements and misrepresentations, the work of *Friedrich*, John Wessel, a life-picture from the Ch. Hist. of the fifteenth century, Ratisb. 1862.

[2] Compl. ed. of his theol. works, or *Farrago Wesseli*, Viteb. 1522, pref. by *Luther*.

He had foretold the expulsion of the Pope and the house of the Medici, and when Charles VIII. of France entered Florence and drove out the merchant princes, his *prophecy* seemed in part to have been verified by the event. The French were shortly compelled to quit the city, and on their departure a republic was proclaimed, of which Savonarola was the leading and guiding genius. It was to be a model Christian commonwealth. A severe censorship was established over morals, sumptuary laws passed, the haunts of vice and dissipation closed, and all sorts of follies repressed. The enthusiasm—an enthusiasm scarcely distinguishable from fanaticism—ran so high that virtuous ladies and notorious courtesans, gay men of the town and grave scholars from the schools and universities, came in one undistinguished troop and cast articles of dress, gems of art, literary productions, and whatever contributed to luxury or savored of pagan refinement, into one great pyramid, on the square before St. Mark's, to be there consumed by the flames.

Pope Alexander, after having received many complaints against the preacher, cited him, in the year 1495, to appear at Rome and answer a charge of heresy. Refusing to appear, he was forbidden to preach. He did leave off for a time, and, as *Guicciardini* says, might have hoped to receive papal pardon and absolution within a comparatively short period; but his impetuous temper could ill brook delay, and he again appeared in the pulpit, raging more furiously than ever against the Pope. In the meantime, the republic had become unpopular; *it was found impracticable;* a conspiracy was formed for the restoration of the exiled Medici. This was discovered, and six of the chief conspirators executed; but the execution was itself a violation of Savonarola's own law, and served to hasten his downfall. When political difficulties were thus gathering about him in menacing numbers and importance, a bull arrived from Rome (1497), containing a sentence of excommunication against him and a threat of interdict against the city of Florence, if steps were not taken to restrain his fanatical excesses.

The following year the party of the Medici called the *Arrabiati* or *Enraged* came into power. They had a representative in the Franciscan, *Francesco da Puglia* (Francis Apulus), who denounced Savonarola, his political policy, and religious fanaticism. To determine which was right an appeal was made to divine judgment by ordeal of fire. This was to decide whether or not the prophecies and acts of Savonarola were really what he represented or others believed them to be. But when the trial was about to come off, the great Dominican and his party threw difficulties in the way, and evaded the test altogether. The revulsion in public feeling was instantaneous and complete. The fickle multitude wished to vent their anger upon their former hero, but being prevented, took their revenge in witty sarcasms and caustic irony. Savonarola was now cast into prison and brought to trial before the new magistrate. The acts of the trial were forwarded to Rome, and on the evidence they afforded he was declared a heretic, a schismatic, and a disturber of the peace. He, with two others of his Order, was given over to the civil power, and on May 23, 1498, the three were executed and their bodies burned.

Savonarola suffered death with courage and fortitude, and his true character is still an unsolved question with many,[1] but his Order has never ceased to cherish his memory with sympathetic affection. Judging, however, from the reliant assurance, the defiant tone, and the daring effrontery pervading all Savonarola's discourses, it would seem that he is not unfairly charged with being a forerunner of Luther; but in all that concerns the essential points of Catholic faith and tradition, there appears no reason to call in question his orthodoxy. In some of his writings, as the "*Triumphus Crucis*" and the *Expositio* Psalmi 31 and 50, the latter of which was also published by Luther, he rivals in their peculiar literature the best mystics of his age. To make Savonarola, therefore, one of a group of reformers of the sixteenth century, as has been done in the monument recently erected to the memory of Luther at Worms, is an obvious falsification of historic truth.[1]

---

[1] His defenders, *J. F. Picus de Mirandula*, Vita Patris Hieronym. Savonar., with documents, ed. *Jac. Quétif* (Dominican), Paris, 1674, 3 T. *Pacif. Burlamacchi*, Vita Savon., ed. *Mansi*, in *Baluzii* Miscellan., Luc. 1761 f., T. I., and the modern Protestant biographies. See p. 913, n. 1. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., p. 638-648; French transl., Vol. 21, p. 239-250.

§ 283. *The Inquisition* (*cf.* § 237).

Nic. Eymericus († 1309), Directorium inquisitionis, Barcin. 1503, c. comm. *F. Pegnae*, Rom. 1578; Venet. 1607 f. *Ludovici de Parma*, De origine, officio et progressu officii sanctae inquisitionis, libb. III., Matrit. 1598; Ant. 1619 f. *Phil. a Limborch*, Historia inquisitionis, Amst. 1692 f. *Reuss*, Collection of the Instructions given to the Spanish Court of Inquisition, transl. from the Spanish into German, with preface, by *Spittler*, Hanover, 1788. *A. Llorente*, Histoire critique de l'inquisition d'Espagne, Par. 1817 sq., 4 vols.; Germ by *Höck*, Gmünd, 1819 sq., 4 vols. As to the latter, see Tübg. Quart. Rev. 1820–22. This "Critical History of the Inquisition" was translated into French, under the author's eye, by *Alexis Pellier*, Paris, 1817–18, and also into most of the European languages. Prescott, in his Ferdinand and Isabella, III. 467–470; Ranke, in his Fürsten and Völker des südlichen Europas, I. 242, and others, have shown the plainly partisan character of this work, which professes to be founded on authentic documents, but abounds in exaggerations. (Tr.) The biography of Llorente († 1823), by *Pfeilschifter* (in the *Catholic*, Mentz, 1824, Vol. XIII., p. 1–35), and by *Eckstein* (in the *Catholic*, 1827, Vol. XXIV., p. 200–210). According to the excellent observations of Baron Eckstein, Llorente was a Jansenist in religion and a utilitarian in politics. Cf. *de Maistre*, Lettres à un gentilhomme Russe sur l'inquisition espagnole; German, Mentz, 1836. **Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, ch. 18. (The Spanish Inquisition and the questionable authority of Llorente.) Tr. add: *J. Balmes*, Catholicism and Protestantism compared in relation to Civilization.

Innocent III., because he ordered heretics to be looked after in Southern France, and to be either instructed and brought back to the Church, or, if obstinate, prevented from doing harm by consigning them to perpetual imprisonment, has been generally credited as the author of the *Inquisition.* This, however, is far from correct. Previously to the time of Innocent III., the *Eleventh Ecumenical* or *Third Council of Lateran*, held in 1179, had published a decree declaring that, "though the Church thirsts not for blood (*ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*), a fear of corporal punishment is nevertheless frequently salutary to the soul of man, and that therefore such

---

[2] Cf. The Luther Monument of Worms, in the light of truth, 2 ed. Mentz, 1869.

heretics and their abettors as would not be content to act silently and in private, but *boldly* insisted on preaching their errors *publicly*, thus *perverting* weak and silly people and inflicting *cruelties* upon the faithful, sparing neither churches, widows, nor orphans, should be denied all intercourse with the orthodox, and that an indulgence of two years should be granted those who would wage war against them." The *Council of Verona* (1184), presided over by Pope Lucius III., and at which the Emperor *Frederic I.* was present, in compliance with the above decree, directed the bishops "to inform themselves, either personally or through their representatives, concerning persons on whom either popular rumor or private denunciation had affixed the suspicion of heresy; and in dealing with them to make a distinction between the suspected, the convicted, the repentant, and the relapsed, apportioning a proper punishment to each; and, finally, after prescribing spiritual punishment, to hand them over to the *civil* authority." Such was the real and true origin of the Inquisition. It was not till much later, when heretical fanaticism, spurning all overtures of the Holy See, and exciting public indignation by the cruel assassination of *Peter of Castelnau*, that Pope Innocent III. resolved upon vigorous measures for its suppression; not, as has been asserted, to give a sanction to tyrannous and arbitrary measures, but in some sort unwillingly, fearing in his paternal solicitude, that the good grain might be plucked with the tares, that some might manifest a stubborn spirit, and the weak be driven into heresy. The *Twelfth Ecumenical*, or *Fourth Council of Lateran* (1215), gave the following instructions to inquisitors: "The accused shall be informed as to the charges preferred against him, that an opportunity may be given him of defending himself. His accusers shall be made known to him, and he himself shall have a hearing before his judges. Bishops shall either personally or through their representatives make the circuit of their dioceses twice yearly, if possible, but once certainly; they shall appoint two or three laymen of integrity, who shall be bound by oath to seek out heretics; they may also commit this office to the whole people of a district (*inquisitores, inquisitio*), who shall also be bound by oath to look up and denounce heretics." In the *Council of Toulouse*, held in 1229, during the pontificate of *Gregory IX.*, the *Episcopal Inquisition* was formally established and received definite organization. Its courts were raised to the dignity of regular tribunals, the methods and duties of which were laid down in an instrument embracing fifteen chapters.[1] Lest bishops might be tempted to spare their friends, Gregory IX. sent foreign monks, chiefly *Dominicans*, to perform the duties of inquisitors (1232).

---

[1] The following are the principal instructions given to *inquisitores hereticae pravitatis:*

The first chapter commands that every archbishop and bishop shall appoint, in each parish, a priest and two or three laymen of piety and good repute, who shall bind themselves, under oath, to search out diligently heretics, their aiders, concealers, and protectors, and make them known to the bishop, the lord of the manor, or their officials.

Chapters second and third make the same provision for the districts of exempted abbots and temporal princes.

Chapter fourth ordains that any one who knowingly conceals a heretic shall be delivered up for punishment and have his lands confiscated.

Chapters fifth and sixth provide that any landed proprietor on whose estates heretics have been discovered shall suffer the legal punishment of said neglect, and that the house in which the heretic has been found shall be destroyed and the estate confiscated.

Chapter seventh decrees that any remissness on the part of officials in the prosecution of heretics shall be punished with loss of office and confiscation of property.

Chapter eighth provides that in order to avoid the consequences of unjust or slanderous accusations, the arraigned shall not suffer punishment until he has been examined by either the bishop or his appointed delegate, and declared to be guilty of heresy.

Chapter tenth ordains that those who have abjured heresy shall be removed into an uninfected district, be intrusted with no public charge, and wear upon their dress two colored crosses until absolved by either the Pope or his legate.

Chapter eleventh prescribes that if the conversion of a heretic has been effected through fear, he shall be kept under arrest, to prevent his perverting others, and the expenses of his imprisonment be defrayed by himself, if in good circumstances, but if poor, by the bishop.

Chapter twelfth ordains that males over fourteen and females over twelve years of age shall abjure heresy, and any one refusing to do so shall be treated as one suspected of heresy.

Chapter thirteenth orders that those who do not go to confession and communion *three times a year*—viz., at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost—unless excused by their confessors, shall be held suspected of heresy.

Chapter fifteenth forbids any one either suspected or convicted of heresy to practice medicine. This was intended to guard against the frightful crimes

The inquisition thus established was no longer as formerly a local tribunal, but one having general jurisdiction. Besides the reasons already given[1] for the severity exercised toward heretics, it may be added that sectaries like the Cathari, Waldenses, and Albigenses were equally dangerous to Church and State, and by boldly and defiantly attacking the universal belief of the *One*, True, and Only saving Church, excited the alarm of both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and drew upon themselves penalties of various degrees, not excluding perpetual imprisonment, tortures, and death. It is doubtful if *in our own day* sectaries as dangerous and malignant as the Albigenses and Cathari would be treated more leniently; and if so, why should we marvel at their treatment in the Middle Ages, *so eminently religious* in character, where public opinion breathed the very spirit of Our Lord's admonition: "Fear not those that kill the body and can not kill the soul, but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell;"[2] when Church and State were so intimately united; and when *heresy* was associated in the public mind as a crime equally offensive and dangerous to both, and apostasy from the faith, an evil more heinous and not less menacing to social order than larceny and murder.[3] Hence, once a person indicted for heresy

---

such persons were suspected of committing, known as the "*endura.*" (*Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 194 sq.; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 176.)

Speaking of these provisions, the writer of an able series of articles on the Inquisition, in the *Dublin* Review for 1867, remarks: "These are the laws for the establishment of the Inquisition, and the rules which were given for its guidance; and when we take in view the frightful evils they were intended to counteract, and the state of Europe, then entirely destitute of a preventive and detective police, we must admit that they were far from being too severe. The rigor with which they were executed undoubtedly prevented a renewal of hostilities in the south of France; and the fact that the Manichaean heresy succumbed before them is a proof that they were wisely adapted to the age in which they were enacted." (Tr.)

[1] p. 669.

[2] Matt. x. 28.

[3] This is precisely the sense in which *Honorius III.* wrote to Louis VIII., King of France, concerning the Albigenses: "Since it is the duty of the civil power to bring brigands and thieves to justice, how can you, who are intrusted with the welfare of the whole State, neglect to rid your kingdom of heretics, *who plunder and drag to perdition souls so much more precious than earthly treasures?*" The same language is employed by Innocent III.: "Cum enim

had been found guilty, he was handed over to the *civil* authority for punishment, with the however invariable prayer that "*he might be spared, and not condemned to death.*" As has already been observed, princes of very different character, like the Emperor *Frederic II.*, *Raymond VII.*, Count of Toulouse, and Louis IX., King of France, enforced the inquisitorial laws with extreme severity, enjoining their faithful execution upon the magistracy.[1]

It is to be noted that the Inquisition was at first nowhere established as a *permanent* tribunal, such as it became later on in Spain. *Gregory IX.* (1237–1241) and *Innocent IV.* confined its jurisdiction within narrow limits in Southern France, and *Boniface VIII.* (1298) and *Clement V.* (1305) considerably modified the rigor of its rules. After these changes had been made, and partly in consequence of them, the Inquisition was established in the whole of France, in Italy, Germany, and Poland, and by act of parliament in England (1400). One can not help deploring the fate of those heretics who, like the "*witches*" of a later day, expiated their offenses by the penalty of death, and regretting with *St. Augustine*, that efficient and progressive disciplinary enactments, sufficiently severe, but stopping short of extreme punishment, had not been employed to reclaim them from their error and bring them back to the Church; but still we can not agree

---

secundum legitimas sanctiones *reis laesae majestatis* punitis capite bona confiscentur eorum, quanto magis qui aberrantes in fide Domini Dei filium offendunt, a capite nostro, quod est Christus, ecclesiastica debent restrictione praecidi et bonis temporalibus spoliari, *cum longe sit gravius aeternam, quam temporalem laedere majestatem.* — Damnati vero praesentibus saecularibus potestatibus aut eorum ballivis relinquantur animadversione debita puniendi." It is worthy of note that many secular princes held the same ideas. As to *Frederic II.* (*Petri de Vineis*, epp. I. 25–27; *Goldasti* Constitut. Imper., T. I., p. 295); concerning *Louis IX.*, King of France (*Laurière*, Ordinances des rois de France, Paris, 1723, T. I., p. 50 sq.); on *Raymund VII.* of Toulouse (Statuta Raymundi super haeresi Albigensi an. 1233, in *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 265 sq.) *Wladislaus Jagello*, King of Poland, also confirms the laws against the heretics, in the year 1424. See *Januszawski*, Statuta prawa, etc., Krak. 1600, fol. 260–268.

[1] "We should bear in mind," says the Protestant *Bluhme*, "that these things happened under an emperor (Frederic II.), who had made himself odious to the Catholic Church, and that the worst horrors of the Inquisition were first perpetrated after it had passed into the hands of the Spanish kings." (System of Canon Law, Bonn, 1858, p. 49.)

with *Protestants* in condemning the Inquisition and its methods of dealing with heresy, as inducing mental servitude and affording a pretext and a means of taking a bloody revenge. To be just to the Middle Ages, they should be judged *by the principles and ideas of those times* and not of our own. Let any one wishing to get a definite notion of the legislation then in force against heretics, look into the *Mirror of Suabia and Saxony*, or the Code of *Frederic II.*, the Hohenstaufen, or the still more modern Code of *Charles V.* (1532.)[1] Protestants boasting of superior mental freedom have affected to ignore the weight of reason based upon contemporaneous circumstances, and while arraigning Catholics have passed in silence over the policy of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Calvin*, and *Beza*. Did not these men support by arguments at once solid and decisive the lawfulness of coercive measures against heretics? Did they not prove the sincerity of their convictions by applauding in practice what they advocated in theory? Did they not make a signal and terrible application of their principles to a vast number of persons?[2] Did they not punish witchcraft and sorcery as capital crimes, at the very moment when Catholics like *Cornelius Loos*, at Mentz († 1598), and, still later, the Jesuits *Adam Tanner* († 1632), and particularly *Frederic von Spee* († 1635), were earnestly protesting against the policy as absurd; and when *Catholic* sovereigns at the request of Catholic priests were abolishing these tribunals? (Vide infra, § 377.)

Although it is notorious that the *Spanish Inquisition* was wholly different in character and aim from that established by the *Holy See*, strenuous and numerous efforts have been made to identify the two for the sole purpose of aspersing the Catholic Church. After the kingdoms of Castile and

---

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Conc. of Councils, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 214 sq.

[2] To instance a few—*Felix Mans*, the Anabaptist, was drowned at the instigation of Zwinglius (qui mergunt mergantur); *Servetus* was burned by the advice of Calvin, because he held heretical doctrines on the Trinity; *Gentilis* was beheaded; *Sylvanus* of *Ladenburg* was put to the sword in the market-place of Heidelberg; Chancellor *Crell*, after suffering inhuman torture to the demoniacal amusement of his persecutors, was finally beheaded for having embraced Calvinism; *Henning Brabant*, after having been frightfully mutilated, was executed because of his pretended familiarity with the devil (see § 337); *Carlstadt*

Aragon had been united into one by the marriage of *Isabella* and *Ferdinand* the Catholic (1479), no efforts were spared to consolidate the new monarchy, increase its power, and curb the overbearing insolence of the nobility. To secure these ends, and fill the depleted exchequer by fines and confiscations, the two sovereigns determined to establish the Inquisition, whose special office, from the year 1484, was to oppress the *Moors* and *Jews*, two numerous, wealthy, and influential classes, the implacable enemies of Catholic Spain.[1] From this time forth the Inquisition became a *national* institution in Spain, and not only the lower and illiterate classes, but the nobility, men and women, might be seen in crowds at the *Autos da Fé* (*actus fidei*), the scenes, not only of bloody executions, but of solemn retractions. Those who abjured their

---

and *Hesshusius* were cruelly persecuted; *Kepler*, the celebrated astronomer, provoked, by his scientific teachings, the wrath of the Reformers; and last, but not least, were the victims of the *Star Chamber*, in England. In the small district of *Nürnberg* alone, between the years 1577 and 1617, three hundred and fifty-six persons suspected of heresy and witchcraft were executed, and three hundred and forty-five flogged or mutilated. (See *Besnard's* Repertory, 1842, p. 301.) *Melanchthon's* opinion of the capital punishment pronounced against heretics by Calvin is given below, § 321, note 5.

[1] The author of the articles in the *Dublin Review*, already referred to, after giving the history of the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition confirms the statement of the text. "Ferdinand, however," says he, "had fully determined not to have any purely ecclesiastical institution retarded in its action by over-merciful papal restrictions, but that the inquisitors should be royal officers, paid by and subservient to the crown, whose duty should be strictly confined to determining whether prisoners brought before them were guilty of Judaism or not; and the Pope had been grossly deceived with regard to the formidable position the King intended it should occupy toward his rebellious subjects." (*Hefele*, Life of Card. Ximenes, p. 265.) And again, "Ferdinand had so contrived that the duty, which the Church was bound to perform, and which the Pope could neither refuse nor evade, of declaring where errors in faith existed, should be made subservient to the State purpose of detecting high treason, then identical with Judaism; whilst the Church itself could exercise no controlling influence whatsoever to stay the terrible retributions awarded by the criminal courts of the realm. From that time, therefore, we find Church and State, as hostile elements, combined in accomplishing the same purpose; ecclesiastical royal functionaries designating the multitudes of Judaizing Christians who were destroying the kingdom, yet vainly struggling against the harshness with which an exaggerated instinct of self-preservation led the government, supported by popular feeling throughout all Spain, to sacrifice the object of its dread. Many Judaizers fled the country, and convincing evidence of the well-known merci-

errors were immediately granted their freedom.[1] The sword and olive branch on the armorial bearing of the Inquisition had a deep significance. Neither atheists nor infidels, however, were persecuted in Spain, unless when they attempted to proselytize. The "Holy Office" of Spain was therefore a *purely political institution*, against which Popes sometimes exerted their full influence and power.[2] If the government condescended to appoint churchmen to some of its offices, it did so of its own accord, and their presence not unfrequently softened to clemency the rigor of this terrible tribunal. Such was the influence of *Thomas Torquemada* (1483–1498) and *Diego Deza* (1499–1506), both of whom held the office of Grand Inquisitor. It almost freezes the blood in one's veins to be *informed* that in the interval of three hundred years,

---

ful disposition of the Holy See is afforded by the fact that numbers bent their course toward Rome, and appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff for protection against the cruelty of their king. (*a*) The indignation of Sixtus IV. knew no bounds when he became aware to what extent he had been trifled with, and that his intention to serve the Spanish monarchs, by converting and preserving their heretical subjects, was defeated by the rigorous measures employed. On the 29th of January, 1482, only one year after the establishment of the Inquisition at Seville, he issued a brief to Ferdinand and Isabella, vehemently complaining that he had been defrauded into the publication of the bull confirming the royal plan for such a tribunal; that the intentions of those sovereigns had been wholly misrepresented to him, and that their new institution was in direct opposition to every court of the kind elsewhere, and contrary to the decrees of his predecessors. He rejects the petition of Isabella to introduce tribunals similar to that at Seville into the other Spanish provinces, for the reason that they already possessed them according to the ancient ecclesiastical and episcopal form. He reproves the inquisitors themselves, in the severest language, for their harsh and unpriestly conduct, accuses them of having punished persons who were not even heretics, and declares that he is only withheld from deposing them from their office by regard for the two monarchs. He orders that, for the future, they shall not proceed against heretics at all, except with the concurrence of the respective Castilian bishops. (*b*)

[1] As to Llorente's assertions, cf. *Hefele*, l. c., p. 340 sq.

[2] Cf. *Adolph Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. IV., p. 197.

(*a*) *Prescott*, T. I., p. 254; *Balmes*, pp. 207, 208. At a later period, an *auto-da-fe* was held at Rome in regard to two hundred and fifty Spaniards who had appealed to the Pope. They were all reconciled to the Church, and *not one* was condemned to death.

(*b*) The Papal brief is contained in *Llorente*, T. IV., p. 345. "It was," says *Ranke* (Fursten und Volker, Vol. I., p. 242), "above all things, in its spirit and object, a political institute." "The Inquisition," says *Guizot* (Cours d'histoire moderne V., lec. II.), "was, at first, more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order than the defense of faith." (Tr.)

three hundred and forty-one thousand, or eleven hundred and thirty-six annually, were condemned to capital punishment by the Spanish Inquisition.

But as the English historian, *Gibbon*, remarks, and *de Maistre* reaffirms, even admitting the accuracy of the figures, when compared with the thousands slaughtered in the bloody conflicts occasioned throughout Europe by the introduction of Protestantism, the advantage is on the side of Spain.

CHAPTER III.

ECCLESIASTICAL SCIENCE.

§ 284. *Scholasticism during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

Bossuet-Cramer, Pt. VII., p. 791 sq. *Schröckh*, Ch. Hist., Vol. XXXIV. *Tiedemann*, Genius of Speculative Philosophy, Vol. V., p. 125 sq. *Mattes*, Art. "Scholasticism," in Vol. IX. of the *Freiburg* Cyclopaed.; French transl., art. "Scholastique," Vol. 21, p. 328–398. End of the art. "*Schoolmen*," in *Blunt's* Dict. of Sects, etc. *Ritter*, Hist. of Christian Philosophy, Vol. IV. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 952 sq. *Ueberweg*, Hist. of Philosophy during the age of the Fathers and Schoolmen, p. 210 sq. The works on the Hist. of Christian Literature in general, by *du Pin*, *Ceillier*, *Oudinus*, *Cave*, *Busse*, etc.

The two leading questions that agitated the Schoolmen during these centuries and held the most prominent place in ecclesiastical science, were the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and chiefly the controversy on *Nominalism* and *Realism*. Nominalism and Realism had now become so extreme in their assertions and claims, that while the latter degenerated into a sensuous materialism, the former issued in a mystical idealism, represented by the mystics of these two centuries. Attention was directed principally to philosophical questions, introductory to theological studies, and much time and energy were wasted in discussing useless subtleties and refinements of thought.

At the opening epoch, *Durandus of Saint-Pourçain*, a Dominican friar, and, after the year 1313, a lecturer in Paris,[1] where he was called the *Resolute Doctor* (*Doctor resolutissimus*), and who subsequently became Bishop of Meaux († 1333), acquired prominence by his advocacy of Nominalism. According to him, *whatever has not determinate notes may indeed be an*

---

[1] His principal theological work, Quaestiones super IV. libb. Sententiar., Lugd. 1495 f., which edition also contains his Centiloquium theologicum, theologiam speculativam sub centum conclusionibus complectens. His writings for the Emperor Louis, see in *Goldasti* Monarch., T. I. and II.

object of thought, but can not be said to enjoy true being. In his principal work on the Sentences of the Lombard, he assails the extreme advocacy of the principles of Aristotle, then so universally accepted.

William of Ockham in Surrey, a pupil of Duns Scotus, a Franciscan friar, a professor of theology in Paris, then provincial of his Order in England, the *Carus Magister* of Luther and the *Deliciae quondam* of Melanchthon, excelled all the Schoolmen in wit, severity of reasoning, and rigid intellectual discipline. In the quarrel between the Pope and the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, he employed his powerful pen in the cause of the latter, and boldly attacked the teachings of his master, Duns Scotus. He was surnamed the *Singular* and the *Invincible Doctor*, and the *Venerable Beginner* (*Doctor singularis et invincibilis*, and *Venerabilis inceptor*). He revived Nominalism, which had lain dormant since the days of Roscelin and Abelard, and pursued it to its last consequences. Starting with the principle, *omnis res positiva extra animum eo ipso est singularis*, he characterized universals as *fictio quaedam*, creations of the fancy wholly destitute of reality. He consistently limited all human knowledge to that which is acquired through the medium of the senses by the observation of individual objects, and denied that any reliance could be placed on whatever transcended these limits, thus basing himself squarely upon *the principles of skepticism.* The conflicting views concerning the reality and non-reality of ideas marked in this age the precise relations of science to faith—a circumstance which contributed to make the controversies between the Nominalists (now called *Ockhamites*) and Realists more animated and earnest. The University of Paris was the great battle-field of the two parties. It was here that *John Buridan*, who had held professorships in philosophy and theology[1] until 1358, first proclaimed himself an Ockhamite, and defended Nominalism after it had been condemned by the Faculty of Arts, in the years 1339 and 1340. Nominalism, by the accession of *Peter d'Ailly*, who became Chancellor of the University in 1389, was completely victorious. It was ably advocated in Germany by *Gabriel Biel* of Tübingen; and no less ably opposed by the University of Prague, founded in 1347.

---

[1] Opera ed. Oxon. 1637, 1640. *Bulaeus*, Hist. Univers. Paris., T. IV., p. 257 sq. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 973 sq.

As *Gerson* had already reconciled the antagonistic claims of Scholasticism and Mysticism, he now sought to effect a compromise between Nominalism and Realism. Admitting with the Nominalists that individual objects are not contained *formaliter* in God, he also held with the Realists that they are contained in Him in a sense higher than *virtualiter;* and, in opposition to both, maintained that "*rationes creaturarum* SUPEREMINENTER *sunt in Deo.*" According to this theory everything has a dual being (*ens duplex*)—one by which it is what it is (*natura rei in seipsa*), and the other by which it is what the intellect apprehends it to be (*esse objectale seu repraesentativum in ordine ad intellectum creatum vel increatum*); and hence, he said, all knowledge which does not include these two phases of being is necessarily defective; and to fancy that an apprehension of the *subjective* being or that which exists only in the mind, includes a knowledge of the *objective* or that which is the thing itself, is a delusion not far removed from insanity.[1]

Thomas Bradwardinus,[2] successively professor of theology at the University of Oxford and Archbishop of Canterbury († 1349), surnamed the *Profound* (*Doctor profundus*), and *Thomas of Strasburg* († 1357), both entered the lists against Nominalism; but the efficiency of the former was considerably lessened by his advocacy of a modified predestination, so detrimental to progress in spiritual life and well-nigh fatal to every generous Christian impulse.

Raymond of Sabunde,[3] who, after having been in early life a a physician and jurist, entered the priesthood and became a professor of theology at Toulouse (c. 1436), ably defended Realism in his work entitled "*Theologia naturalis*," in which he followed the method of Alanus. His exertions were directed toward popularizing Scholasticism with a special view to benefiting the infidels of his own country. He did indeed place revealed truth on a level with the teachings of reason, but with no intention of giving equal authority to each; for he says expressly, "God has given both creatures and His own word to man for his comfort, *but God's word must always be of paramount authority*." The ethical principle was the basis of his system, and he accordingly developed the argument drawn from the moral governance of the world for proving the existence of God, better than did Abelard in a former, or Kant in a succeeding age.

---

[1] Subtilitas metaphysicantium si quaerit reperire in rebus ipsis secundum suum esse reale tale esse, quale habent in suo esse objectali, jam non est subtilitas sed stoliditas et vera insania. (de concord. metaphys. cum log.) Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., pp. 748, 749; French transl., Vol. 21, p. 383.

[2] De causa adv. Pelag. libb. III., ed. *Savilius*, Lond. 1618. *Lechler*, De Thoma Bradwardino, Lips. 1862.

[3] *Raymund de Sab.*, Lib. creaturar. s. theol. natur., whereof Viola animae s. de natura hominis is an epitome, Argent. 1496. Latiniore stylo in comp. redact. a. *J. Comenio*, Amst. 1659; Solisb. 1852. *Holberg*, De theol. naturali Raymundi de Sabunde comm., Hall. 1843. *Matzke*, The Natural Theology of Raymond of Sabunde, Breslau, 1846. *F. Nitzsch*, Quaestiones Raimundianae (Periodical of

Among the commentators on Peter Lombard during this epoch may be classed *Peter d'Ailly* († 1425);[1] *Gabriel Biel*[2] of Tübingen, who, like Nicholas of Cusa, had received his scientific training from the Clercs Regular; and, finally, *Paul Cortesius*, whose commentaries have the merit of being written in the elegant Latinity of the classic age.

Most of these writers, while loyally attached to the dogmatic teachings of the Church, are deplorably deficient in the warmth of Christian feeling indicative of the presence and true appreciation of Catholic faith. This is especially conspicuous in the writings of *Pomponatius*, who held that *a principle may be true in philosophy, yet false in theology*.[3] A position so anomalous stripped *Scholasticism* of its original

---

Historical Theology, 1859, nro. 3). †*Huttler*, The Religious Philosophy of Raymond of Sabunde, Augsb. 1851. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1035–78. *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, Vol. IX., p. 497 sq.; French trans., art. *Sébonde*, Vol. 21, p. 438 sq.

[1] Commentarii in IV. libb. Sententiar. et Tractatus, ed. Argentinae, 1490 f., Par. 1500, 4to. The Vita Petri de Alliaco, in *v. d. Hardt*, l. c., T. I., P. VIII., p. 449–487.

[2] Collectorium ex Occamo in IV. lib. Sentent. (Tüb. 1502, 2 T.), Brix. 1574, 4 T., 4to. Serm. de tempore, Tüb. 1500, 4to. Conf. *Trithem.*, De scriptor. eccl. c. 903, and *Linsenmann*, Gabr. Biel, the last of the Schoolmen, and Nominalism (Tübg. Quart. 1865, nro. 3, p. 449 sq.) The *same*, Rise of the University of Tübingen, ibid., p. 195 sq.

[3] Condemned by the fifth Lateran Council, Sess. VIII.

character and tendency, and contributed not a little to alienate religiously minded men from it. A contemporary has left the following picture of its condition at this time. "Scholastic theology," says he, "after having rendered important service in controversies with infidels, and done much to train the mental faculties and sober the judgment, has gradually drifted into a condition of utter uselessness. The new sophists have made a shameless traffic of the word of God and transformed a worthy science into a confused mesh of words. They discuss questions the most futile, deal blows in the air, distort Holy Scripture, and draw upon our holy faith the laughter and ridicule of the world. Even St. Thomas long ago protested against this folly."[1] To correct a tendency so mischievous and degrading, men holding and advocating very different principles came forward, and, basing their claims upon the simple and positive teachings of faith and Holy Writ, put forth their best energies in giving a more practical direction to the one-sided and barren labors of dialecticians. To those who have been frequently mentioned as the true reformers of that age is due also the credit of this movement.

Nicholas de Clemenge, who, after having been successively Rector of the University of Paris and private secretary to Benedict XIII., withdrew from the world to lead a solitary life, and died about the year 1440, criticised unsparingly those who engaged in intellectual pursuits and assumed the teaching office with the sole view of making money. It is the privilege of man, he said, to give a noble and disinterested direction to his mental powers; and to enter upon the study of theology is legitimate only when one's motives are pure and spring from a source higher than that of sordid gain.[2] It is because a rule of conduct so ennobling is lost sight of, that, though doctors of divinity are daily increasing in numbers, there is no perceptible diminution of evil. Moreover, it is but a sterile work to correct intellectual errors when the heart is allowed to riot in vice, and but a cold consolation to know that the clergy are highly cultivated, when the bulk of the people are sunk in error and sin.

---

[1] *Henricus Cornelius Agrippa*, De vanitate scientiarum, lib. I., c. 97.

[2] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De studio theol. (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 473–480); his Life, by *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. II., p. 71; his reformatory writings, ed. *Lydius*, Lugd. Batav. 1613, 4to, and in v. *d. Hardt.*

Nicholas of Cusa was equally emphatic in denouncing the theological tendency of this epoch.[1]

Finally, Chancellor *Gerson*[2] also exerted himself to introduce a better spirit among theologians. He called their attention to the works of St. Bonaventure, and recommended for their special study his *Breviloquium* and *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*, as excellent compendiums of theology. He had also recourse to other expedients to effect a reformation in ecclesiastical studies, and does not seem to have shared the opinions of those who decried *science* as an instrument of good in the amelioration of the world.

§ 285. *Mysticism—The Friends of God.*

The works on Christian Mysticism, by *Görres*, *Helfferich*, *Noak*, see above, p. 732. *Görres*, Introduction to the Life and Writings of *Henry Suso*, by *Diepenbrock*, p. xxv.–cxxxvi. *Greith*, German Mysticism among the Friars Preachers (from 1255–1350), Freiburg, 1861. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1096 sq. *Galle*, Spiritual Voices from the Middle Ages, Halle, 1841 *Ch. Schmidt*, Les Mystiques du quatorzième siècle, Strasb. 1836. The *same*, Études sur le Mysticisme allem., in Mem. de l'Acad. des Sciences mor. et pol., Paris, 1847. *Pfeiffer*, The German Mystics of the fourteenth century, Lps. 1845 sq. *Böhringer*, Ch. Hist. in Biographies, Vol. II., Pt. III. **Lasson*, in *Ueberweg's* Hist. of Philos., § 36, p. 217–235. Tr. add: *Hamberger*, Voices from the Sanctuary of Christian Mysticism, Stuttg. 1657. *Preger*, Preparatory Studies for the Hist. of Germ. Mystic. (in the Journal of Hist. Theol. 1869.)

The writers on Mysticism, like the theologians referred to above, aimed at turning Scholasticism to practical account, and rousing religious life into activity and earnestness. In proportion as Scholasticism became barren and fruitless, Mysticism gained strength, energy, and sobriety. The mystics, though leading a contemplative life, were far from entirely relinquishing the world; on the contrary, they did their best to influence it by their teachings, their zeal, and the light of their example, and to impart to it *the peace* and joy they themselves experienced. With this aim they combined in mystical brotherhoods, called themselves the *Friends of God*, and, making their appearance first on the banks of Lower Rhine, spread thence southward to Cologne and Strasburg, and into Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, and Switzerland, as far as the confines of Upper Italy.[1] If an effort had been made at this time to restrain their zeal within due bounds, it might have taken a more noble and useful direction. Vigorously assailing such as offered them any resistance, they necessarily provoked opposition, and gave the first impulse to a reaction. Their advocacy of *extreme Realism* led them straight to *Pantheism*, and gave rise to their favorite term, "*deification*" (*Vergotten*). These pantheistic teachings were drawn chiefly from the writings of *Master Eckhart*,[2] who, in the beginning of the present epoch (1304–1329), had, with considerable originality and boldness of thought, thrown the peculiar features of Mysticism into *scientific* form. Modern criticism has discovered in his writings many mischievous errors and not a few exalted and pregnant truths.[3] Although his teaching was pantheistic in tendency, his object was to show that one may approach near to God, and become, in some sort, like Him, by leading a holy life; and that the more perfect the likeness grows in him, the less is there of the creature and the more of God. "Why," asks Eckhart, "is God become man?" And he answers: "That I may be born of the same God. For this did God die, that I might die to the world and to creatures."[4]

---

[1] *Nic. Cusanus*, De docta ignorantia (Opp. Basil. 1565 f.) This title was given by the author to his principal work, because he was of opinion that a perfect knowledge of the Trinity was unattainable.

[2] *J. Gerson*, Epp. duo de reform. theol. (Opp., ed. *du Pin*, T. I., p. 120–124.) Concerning Bonaventura, he declares: Bonaventurae opuscula duo; *Breviloquium* et *Itinerarium* tanta sunt arte compendii divinitus composita, ut supra ipsa nihil.

The sweet, the amiable, and the profound *John Tauler* (*Doctor Sublimis et Illuminatus*, †1361) sympathized with the Mystics, and shared their sentiments. He was a member of the

---

[1] *Schmidt*, The Friends of God in the fourteenth century, Jena, 1854 (Vol. V. of the Strasb. Supplem.)

[2] See p. 679.

[3] Cf. *Lasson*, Master Eckhart, Berlin, 1868. The *same*, in *Ueberweg*, p. 219 sq., where also is given a copious bibliography concerning him.

[4] *Gieseler's* Compend. Eccl. Hist. IV. 176, Clark's transl. (Tr.)

Order of St. Dominic, at Strasburg; had been a student of the writings of Eckhart, and about the year 1340 fell under the influence of *Nicholas of Basle,* Eckhart's disciple. He was an indefatigable preacher, and everywhere and at all times exhorted his hearers to become estranged from the world, to keep a guard upon their senses, to freely take upon them the yoke of Christ, to renounce their self-will, and "*to imitate Christ in holy poverty,*" that thus they might become like unto God. But, though meek and humble, he boldly withstood the abuse of *interdict*, and, when the "*Black Death*" was desolating Strasburg, went through the city, from house to house, administering the Sacraments to the sick and dying, and giving consolation to all. This spirit of resistance, his boldness in attempting to reach out beyond the bounds placed by God to human knowledge, and his maintenance of propositions closely allied to Pantheism, drew upon him and his adherents a momentary chastisement.[1]

Henry Suso (*Amandus*) was born at Uberlingen, on the shores of the Lake of Constance, March 21, 1300. He was educated by the Dominicans at Constance and Cologne,[2] into whose hands he was given at the age of twelve, and was regarded as one of the most distinguished ascetics of the Middle Ages. He died at Ulm, in 1365. Less philosophical than Eckhart, and less practical than Tauler, he was more enthusiastical and *poetical* than either in his adoration of the Eternal Wisdom. He was, however, by no means destitute of a spirit of practical piety, and was ever ready to interrupt his contemplation to defend the weak against the strong. His curious work, entitled "*The Nine Rocks*," was unquestionably called forth by the vices of the age, and a fear lest the anger of Heaven might overtake the wicked. This mystic appeals in his writings to all classes of society. Although belonging strictly to no particular school of thought, and having no consistent system, his efforts being chiefly confined to whimsical applications of the mystical theology of the preceding age, yet his underlying principle and motive were contained in the formula: "Man should completely divest himself of carnal nature by imitating Christ's sufferings, and, thus transformed, sink into the depths of the Divine Essence." To arrive at this state, three stages were to be passed through: first, purification, or the deadening of carnal desire; second, illumination, or the filling of the soul with forms of Divine truth; third, perfection, or the fullest enjoyment of heavenly bliss. That he strove earnestly to realize in himself what he preached to others, is abundantly shown in his *autobiography*.[1]

---

[1] *Oberlini* Dissert. de J. Tauleri dictione vernacula et myst., Argentorati, 1786, 4to. Opp. latine reddidit *Surius*, Colon. 1548. — Imitation of the "Indigent Life" of Christ; the best edition of it is that of *Schlosser*, Frcft. on the Main, 1833, cum lexic. Tauleriano. His sermons were published in the same place, in 3 vols., 1826. The history of his own conversion, related by himself, is prefixed to the "Life of Christ." Cf. *C. Schmidt*, John Tauler of Strasburg. Essay on the history of the mysticism and spiritual life of the fourteenth century, Hamburg, 1841. *Baehring*, John Tauler and the Friends of God, Hambg. 1853; *Boehmer*, Nicholas of Basle, and Tauler (Giesebrecht's Damaris, 1865, p. 148 sq.) Cf. Freiburg Theological Review, Vol. IX., p. 268 sq. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1120–28.

[2] *Kärcher* (in the Freiburg Dioc. Arch., Vol. III., year 1868) has demonstrated that *Ueberlingen* is his birthplace. The Life and Writings of Henry Suso, by *Diepenbrock*, Ratisb. 1837. Opera latine reddidit *Surius*, Colon. 1555. Spiritual Flowers of Suso, Bonn, 1834. Patris *Amandi* Horologium sapientiae, Colon. 1856. *H. Amandus*' Life and Writings, Vienna, 1863 sq. *C. Schmidt*, The mystic Henry Suso (Theol. Stud. and Critic. 1843, nro. 4). *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1129–39.

John Ruysbroch (*Doctor Ecstaticus*, † 1381), prior of the canons regular of Grünthal, near Brussels, also advocated three stages in spiritual life,[2] in the last of which one lives entirely in the love of God, and is so completely united to Him that he is dead to all objects of sense. Ruysbroch, while claiming to write under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, makes use of expressions which would seem to indicate that one, while enjoying that close union, loses his personality, and, as a consequence, is absorbed in the Divine Essence. *St. Catharine of Siena*, *St. Bridget*, *St. Angela of Foligno*, the author of the *Theology of the Cross*, and *St. Catherine of Genoa*, the author of the *Theology of Love*, also belong to the mystics of this epoch.

---

[1] The information he here conveys is unique and highly interesting. He tells his routine in taking his meals—how he celebrated New Year's Day and Candlemas; how he spent his time during Carnival and the month of May; his feelings while making the sorrowful way of the Cross with Christ; his thoughts during the singing of the *Sursum Corda* in the Mass, "for he was wont to sing these words with such feeling and pathos that those who heard him could hardly help being inspired with unusual devotion." Cf. *Diepenbrock's* edition of his works, p. 16–29.

[2] Speculum salutis aetern.; summa totius vitae spiritual.; in tabernac. Moys. etc. *Rusbrochii* opp. e Brabantiae germanico idiomate redd. lat. per Surium, Colon. 1555. *Arnswald*, Four of John Ruysbroch's works, in Low-German, Hanov. 1848. Several other works of his, in Flemish, were published at Ghent by Professor *David*, of Louvain. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Hugo of St. Victor and John Ruysbroch, Essay on Myst. Theol., Erlang. 1838. *Ch. Schmidt*, Étude sur Jean Ruysbroch, Strasb. 1863; *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1137–49.

The errors of Ruysbroch found a formidable adversary in *John Gerson* (*Doctor Christianissimus*), who, like Richard of St. Victor in a former age, made an effort to explain *scientifically* the aim and scope of Mysticism, to divest it of its transcendental character, and give it a practical direction.[1] The very essence of Mysticism, said he, consists in knowing God by experience of the heart. Love, which lifts the heart up to the very throne of God, effects an intimate union with the Divinity. As the object of speculative theology is the *true*, so is that of mystical theology the *good* and the *holy*. Scholasticism and Mysticism correspond to the faculties of the soul, by which one knows and desires, and understands and loves, and either of which leads to God. It is the office of Scholasticism to direct Mysticism and keep it within the bounds of truth. It is not enough to have an idea of God—the idea must pervade and animate the whole life of man; and to Mysticism belongs the office of turning to practical account truths which Scholasticism has seized upon and comprehended.

This great theologian, because he had the courage to rebuke John of Burgundy for murdering the Duke of Orleans, was obliged to leave his country and wander an exile through Germany. During this forced absence, and amid the trials that beset him in a strange land, he found comfort in religion, and threw his thoughts into connected form in his work entitled "*De consolatione theologiae.*"[1] When his persecutor had died, Gerson returned to Lyons, where, *it is said*, he took much pleasure in teaching young children catechism during the last years of his life, and where he died in the joy of the Lord (1429), universally venerated by the inhabitants as a saint.[2]

---

[1] Considerationes de theol. myst. (Opp. ed. du Pin, Antv. 1706, 5 T. f.) Cf. *Engelhardt*, De Gersone mystico, P. II., Erl. 1822 sq., 4to. *L'Ecuy*, Essai sur la vie de Gerson, Par. 1832, 2 T. *Ch. Schmidt*, Essai sur Jean Gerson, Strasb. 1839. *Thomassy*, Jean Gerson, Chancelier de Notre Dame et de l'Université de Paris, Par. 1843. *Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 325.

Toward the close of the Middle Ages, Mysticism seems to have existed in a tolerably pure state among the *Brethren of the Common Life* in the Netherlands. Here, *Florence Nadewijns* wrote his *Tractatus devotus s. de spiritualibus exercitiis*;[3] and here, too, *Thomas àKempis* (*Haemerken*), so called from a small town near Cologne, who was first a Brother of the Common Life, and, after receiving orders, prior of the canons regular of St. Augustine of Agnetenberg, near Zwoll, wrote, besides his minor works, his *Imitation of Christ*,[4] in four books.

---

[1] Among the works of Gerson edited by *du Pin* is the *De consolatione theologiae* libb. IV., where the author has left an example of a soul, in exile and in the midst of trial, resolutely seeking comfort in the consolations of a good Christian life. The Dominican, John de Tambacho († 1372), had already set the example in his Speculum patientiae, sive de consolatione theologiae, Opp., T. I., p. 125–183.

[2] Cf. *Gersoniana*, libb. IV., in ed. opp. Joan. Gerson by *du Pin*, T. I., p. i.–clxi. His real name was *Charlier;* Gerson is the name of his birthplace, in Champagne. He succeeded *d'Ailly* as chancellor of the University of Paris, and was not less erroneous in his teachings than his predecessor. At Constance he upheld the superiority of the council over the Pope. In his "*Opus de modo uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam*," he draws a distinction between the "*ecclesia Catholica universalis*" and the "*Sedes Apostolica*," the latter of which he claims is only "*instrumentalis et operativa clavium universalis ecclesiae, et executiva potestatis ligandi et solvendi*," and does not enjoy the prerogative of inerrancy. He also declaimed with immoderate warmth against reservations; annats, or the first year's revenue paid by a bishop into the papal treasury on taking possession of his see; expectances, or the sum paid to the Roman Dataria for the promise of a preferment not yet fallen vacant; against the abuse of excommunication; the plurality of benefices vested in a single person; exemption of monasteries (from episcopal authority), and their unnecessary multiplication; against a uselessly elaborate liturgy; the replacing of the principal and time-honored festivals of the Church by others of late introduction; and, finally, the sordid spirit of the clergy and the promotion of ignorant ecclesiastics, while others of distinguished ability were passed over for no other reason than that they were in indigent circumstances. *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 402. (Tr.)

[3] Ed. **Nolte*, Friburgi, 1862.

[4] His lesser works are: Soliloquia; Hortulus rosar.; Vallis lilior.; Hospitale pauperum; De solitudine et silentio; Hymni et cantica; Vitae Beator. (Opp.

This work, which, excepting the Holy Bible, is more generally read[1] than any existing book, contains the fundamental principles of the most exalted and genuine piety, and shows its author to have been one of the noblest and purest of Mystics. If surpassed in depth of thought by Tauler in his "*Imitation of the Indigent Life of Jesus,*" Kempis is that writer's superior in the simplicity and purity of sentiment so dear to every heart. The pervading spirit of the work is a loving, an intimate, and a mysterious converse of the soul with God and Jesus Christ; and the means proposed by the author for arriving at this close intimacy with God is the frequentation of the Sacraments, constant meditation on the truths of Holy Writ, and a correct appreciation of the things of this world. Catching the true Christian inspiration of every age since the Church began, Kempis proclaims the *Eucharist* to be the central object of Christian worship and the great heart whence issue the streams of Christian life, and consistently makes this overwhelming mystery the subject of the last and longest book of the *Imitation.*

---

omnia, ed. *Sommalius*, Antv. 1604, in 4to; in 16mo recog., *Amort*, Colon. 1757; ed. Franc. Xav. *Kraus*, Trevir. 1868.) His larger work, *De Imitatione Christi*, has been translated into six languages, the original being Latin—viz., Italian, Spanish, French, German, English, and Greek (ancient or classic); ed. *J. B. Weigl*, Solisbaci (Sulzbach) (not Ratisbon—Tr.), in Bavaria, 1837. The authorship of this celebrated work has been hotly contested from the seventeenth century onward, the French Benedictines and others claiming that either *Gerson* or a fictitious abbot, *Gersen* of Vercelli, was its author. Cf. *du Pin*, De auct. lib. de imitat. Chr. (Opp. Gerson, T. I., p. 121.) *Gregory*, Mémoire sur le véritable auteur de l'imitation de J. Chr. revue par le Comte Lonjuinaes, Par. 1827, transl. by *Weigl*, Sulzbach, 1832. *Silbert*, *Gersen* (Abbot of Vercelli), *Gerson*, and *Kempis*, which is the author? Vienna, 1828. The authorship of the Imitation is now proved by the chronicle of Windeshem to belong to Thomas of Kempis. Among those who most ably championed his cause were *Amort* (Scutum Kempense, Colon. 1759, in the append. to his ed., and Deductio critica, Aug. Vindel. 1761); *Bähring*, Thomas of Kempis, the Preacher of the Imitation of Christ, Berlin, 1849, p. 188–193. *Gregory*, Hist. du livre de l'imitat. de J. Chr. et son véritable auteur, Paris, 1842, 2 T. (unimportant.) *Malou*, Recherches hist. et crit. sur le véritable auteur du livre de l'imitat., etc., III. ed., Paris, 1858. See Tübg. Quart. 1859, p. 319 sq. *Dr. Nolte*, Essay on the Hist. of the Book of the Imit. of Chr. (Scheiner & Häusle's Periodical, Vienna, 1855, VII., nros. 1, 2.) La *Civiltà Cattolica*, fr. Jan. to June, 1875, Della Controv. Gerseniana. (Tr.)

[1] Over two thousand editions have been published in various languages, the first at Augsburg, 1468. Best. ed. by *Rosweyd*, S.J., Antwerp, 1617, and oftener.

. § 286. *The so-called Revival of Learning by the Humanists.*

Tiraboschi, Storia della letteratura Italiana, T. V., Pt. I. *Meiners*, Biographies of illustrious men of the epoch of the Revival, Zurich, 1796 sq., 3 vols. Vite e Ritratti d'Illustri Italiani. (Tr.) *Jagemann*, Hist. of the Arts and Sciences in Italy, Vol. III., Pts. II. and III. *Heeren*, Hist. of classical Literature in the M. A. (Hist. works, Pts. IV. and V.) *Voigt*, The Revival of classic Antiquity, or 1st century of Humanism, Berlin, 1859. Cf. *Moehler* and *Erhard*, Hist. of the Revival of Learning, Magdeb. 1827–32, 3 vols. (Giesser, Annuary of Theol., Vol. I., p. 173 sq.) *Stoeckl*, Hist. of the Philos. of the M. A., Vol. III.

It is now pretty generally taken for granted that the knowledge of classic literature in the West dates from the fall of Constantinople (1453), and that a taste for true science was revived in Europe by the fugitive scholars from the capital of the Greek Empire. The Schoolmen were the first to give to theology a scientific form, and, being themselves men of solid learning, they created a science at once new and exact, to which it would be well for some of the self-sufficient scientists of our own age to give a little serious study before superciliously assuming their own vast superiority. Is it necessary here to state that the greatest critics have placed the *poetical productions* of the Middle Ages beside the epopees of Homer, or to remind the reader that all the important sciences were cultivated in the universities *founded* in the preceding and flourishing in the present epoch? There was not an interval throughout the whole of the Middle Ages, when the *ancient classic authors* were neglected. This is evident from the writings of *John Scotus Erigena*, in the ninth century, and, in the tenth, from those of *Gerbert* and others, and from the heroic poems of the nun *Hroswitha*, all of whom exhibit an intimate acquaintance with the famous authors of antiquity. And what is true of the ninth and tenth centuries may be said of every succeeding age, particularly in regard to the Roman classics, which formed the *basis and guide* of the course of studies included in the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. In the thirteenth century many translations of Greek authors—notably of Aristotle—made their appearance; and that original genius, *Raymond Lullus*, even proposed to establish a great institution in the very heart of the University of Paris for the study of Arabic and Greek literature.[1] Does not the fourteenth century furnish marvelous proofs of the ardor with which the study of antiquity was then pursued? Does not *Dante*,[2] in the *Divina Commedia*, that powerful representation of the second creation, wrought through Christ, exhibit a devotion to Virgil quite as ardent as to St. Thomas? Is he not at once a true poet and a rigorous theologian? Did he not form his national language, prescribe rules of taste, and rouse into life and activity the latent energies of the human mind? Dante summons popes, religious orders, and the clergy before his tribunal, and passes judgment upon them. Florence banishes him, and the States of the Church receive the exile († 1321).

Again, *Petrarca*, the first and greatest of Italian lyric poets, was thoroughly imbued with the genius of antiquity. His writings breathe the very spirit of ancient Greece and Rome, and are warm with their life; and the chaste purity and sweetness of his songs (*Rime*) have done fully as much as Dante's Divina Commedia to refine the taste and language of Italy. He was crowned poet-laureate in the Capitol at Rome in 1341. An elegant poet, he was no less an unwearied student, and was engaged throughout his whole life in collecting Latin manuscripts, traveling through France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, in search of such treasures. He was the first scholar of modern times who, as his works abundantly show, wrote Latin with the classic purity of the Augustan age;[3]

---

[1] *Raym. Lullus* writes in a letter (*Martène* et *Durand*, Thesaur. Anecdot., T. II., p. 1319): "Hic conscientiae stimulus me remordet et coëgit me venire ad vos, quorum summae discretionis et sapientiae interest ordinare circa tantum negotium tam pium, tam meritorium, tam Deo gratum servitium et utile toti mundo, videlicet quod hic Parisiis, ubi fons divinae scientiae oritur, ubi veritatis lucerna refulget populis Christianis, fundaretur *studium Arabicum*, *Tartaricum et Graecum*, *ut nos linguas adversariorum Dei et nostrorum docti*," etc.

[2] See the Catholicism of *Dante*, in the evangelical church paper of *Hengstenberg*, 1842, nros. 10–12, and *Goeschl*, Dante's instruction on the creation of the world, etc., Berlin, 1842. †*Artaud*, Histoire de Dante Alighieri, Par. 1842. Dante et la philosophie catholique au treizième siècle, par †*Ozanam*, Par. 1840; Germ., Münster, 1844. *Müller*, art. Dante, in the Freiburg Cyclopaed. Cf. p. 788, note 1.

[3] The principal are his Epistolae; De Vitis Virorum Illustrium; De Remediis utriusque Fortunae; De Vita Solitaria; Rerum Memorandarum libri IV.; De Contemptu Mundi, etc. His "*Africa*," an epic poem on the second Punic war,

and at his voice all Europe turned to the zealous study of the old Roman models († 1374).

Boccaccio, the celebrated author of the *Decamerone*, whose limpid, airy, and graceful style places him in the foremost rank of Italian prose-writers, was also something more than a *litterateur.* He was a great collector of books, and transcribed, with his own hand, many rare Greek manuscripts. It is said he was the first Italian to procure from Greece copies of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer. He was also the first to familiarize himself with Greek ideas and modes of thought, and to arrange in systematic form an ancient mythology[1] with a view to facilitate the study of the classics.

Villani, a contemporary of Petrarca's, was not inferior to Herodotus as an historian; and mediaeval writers, long anterior to the bard who sang the praises of Laura, gave Latin translations of the works of St. Chrysostom, St. John Climacus, St. Macarius, and of the orations of Demosthenes.

Cardinal *Nicholas de Cusa*, when returning from his mission to Constantinople, brought back with him a large quantity of Greek manuscripts, which excited no little interest in Europe; and he also gained for himself immortal renown as a mathematician and astronomer *by being first to proclaim and defend the theory that the earth moves around the sun.*

The presence of the Orientals at the Council of Florence (1439) largely contributed to stimulate the study of Greek antiquity, and to the Church is due the entire credit of having guided taste in this direction. Her influence was at work and deeply felt long before the arrival of the fugitives from Constantinople, who were themselves, for the most part, priests and monks. The kind greeting and warm welcome which even the less distinguisned of the refugees received, both at Rome and at Florence, where the house of Medici was then supreme, and for which they were indebted chiefly to the clergy, prove incontestably that these were not insensi-

---

procured him the laurel wreath. Of his *Rime*, 300 editions. Collective editions of his whole works, Basle, 1495, 1554, and 1591; Lyons, 1601, 2 T. f. Sonetti, Canzoni, Trionfi.

[1] De genealogia deorum, libb. XV., Bas. 1532, f. Decamerone, Germ. by *Witte*, 3d ed., Lps. 1859, 5 vols.

ble to the charms of polite literature or destitute of a refined taste. It is, however, equally true that their minds were still further cultivated by such accomplished Hellenists as *Hermolaus Barbarus* († 1493), *Angelus Politianus*, and others. The revival of classic antiquity was soon felt in every part of Italy, and *the study of Pagan authors* everywhere lauded as the only source of human culture or *humanities*. From the year 1450 onward, troops of young men from every part of Europe flocked to Italy to frequent her academies and devote themselves to the newly revived studies, which were entirely independent of theology until *Laurentius Valla*, successively professor at Naples and Rome († 1456), contemptuously putting aside the scholastic method, wrote, in elegant Latin, short and simple annotations on the text of the New Testament. He also wrote an *ethical* work, wholly pagan in tone, but probably as good as was consistent with a slavish imitation of profane antiquity. His historical works are of much greater merit.[1]

Paul Cortesius was more successful in his efforts to build up a system of Christian dogmatics on ancient Roman models.[2] Still, he did not, like others, adapt Christian truths and ecclesiastical institutions to Pagan mythology, Pagan modes of thought, and Pagan expression.[3]

Many translations of the Bible shortly appeared, which, it was claimed, were far more *Ciceronian* in purity and style than the Vulgate. As a rule, these modern *Platonists* belonging to the academy founded at Florence in 1440 by *Gemistius Pletho*[1] still defended some of the truths of Christianity; and many of them—and these the more distinguished, as, for example, *Marsilio Ficino* and *Pico della Mirandola*—endeavored to show that all the leading religious truths found among various peoples might be traced back to one primitive revelation; but a large number of them also placed Plato before Christ. Ficino, who held Platonism to be the basis of the Christian sytem, was so devoted to Plato that he kept a light burning before his image, and proposed that his works, like the books of Holy Writ, should be publicly read in the churches. Pletho even expressed the hope that Christianity would develop into a universal religion not unlike Paganism. *Angelo Poliziano* (*Politianus*), a pupil of Marsilio Ficino's, became, as a humanist, poet, and philosopher, almost as famous as his master.[2]

---

[1] Elegantiar. Latinae linguae, libb. VI.; dialectic., libb. III.; Annot. in N. T. (ed. Erasmus, Par. 1505, f.; rep. Revius, Amst. 1631); *de summo bono;* de ementita Const. M. donatione (Opp. Bas. 1540 and 1543, f.)

[2] *Paul. Cortesius* in Sententias. Qui in hoc opere eloquentiam cum theologia conjunxit, Rom. 1512, f. He dedicated this work to Pope Julius II. Cf. *Jagemann*, Hist. of the liberal arts, Vol. III., Pt. III., p. 219 sq.

[3] Thus *Bembo*, private secretary to Leo X., called Christ "*Minervam, e Jovis capite ortam;*" the Holy Ghost, "*Auram Zephyri coelestis;*" and the *forgiving of sins*, "*Deos superosque manesque placare.*" Others styled the *Cardinals*, "*Patres conscripti*," and the Sacred College, "*Collegium augurum;*" priests, "*Flamines;*" nuns, "*Vestales*," and the Blessed Virgin "*Diva.*" It was said of St. Francis that he was "in numerum *Deorum* receptus," and, in still more offensive phrase, *Bessarion* comforted the son of Gemistius Pletho by telling him his departed father had risen into purer and heavenly spheres, and had joined the choirs of the Olympic gods in the mystic mazes of the Bacchanalian dance

Side by side with these modern Platonists rose a school of Neo-Peripaticians, or disciples of *Aristotle*, zealous defenders of their *peculiar tenets*, and dangerously skeptical. Their leading representative, *Pietro Pomponazzo*, a professor at Padua and Bologna († 1526), openly declared that, from a philosophical point of view, the immortality of the soul and the providence of God were extremely problematical, but might be accepted as theological verities.[3] This proposition was severely censured by the *Fifth Ecumenical Council of Lateran*, and measures enacted to put a stop to so unwarrantable an abuse of the Pagan classics and philosophy. The learned and infamous *Macchiavelli* († 1530), in his work *De Principatibus*, or, as it has since been called, *Del Principe*, or *The Prince*, advocated a radically Pagan system, having nothing in common with Christianity, and being only a faithful reproduction of the faithless policy of ancient Rome. The essential and most prominent element of the system consistently and logically developed in *The Prince*, is an intense and crafty selfishness.[1]

---

[1] *Sieveking*, Hist. of the Platonic Academy at Florence, Götting. 1812; *Roscoe*, Lorenzo de' Medici; *Stöckl*, Vol. III., p. 136 sq.

[2] Opera, Basil. 1554, fol. Cf. *Bonafous*, De Ang. Polit. vita et operibus, Paris, 1846.

[3] *Petri Pomponatii* lib. de immortal. animae, Bon. 1516. Cf. Erasmi lib. XXVI., ep. 34. *Harduin.* Coll. Concilior., T. IX., p. 1719 sq. Cf. The Materialism of Petrus Pomponatius (Catholic, February number of 1861). *Stöckl*, Vol. III., p. 202 sq.

Many of the *Humanists*, following the current of public opinion, drifted into indifferentism, and substituted for the spirit of Christianity the empty forms of an idolatrous and sensuous worship. At the opening of the fifteenth century the alarm had already been sounded by *Vincent Ferrer*. "The golden light of a holy life," said he, "is no longer visible in the world; the glowing effulgence shed upon souls by the teachings of the Gospel has faded away, and in interpreting Holy Scripture it has become fashionable to adopt a sort of poetic refinement and philosophic flavor that make the preacher less a disciple of Christ than a worshiper of Cicero and Aristotle."

At the close of this same century, another voice—that of *Jerome Savonarola*—was heard thundering from the pulpit against the Pagan spirit pervading all classes. "The refinement of our souls," said he, "loathes the banquet of Holy Scripture. We listen to the eloquence of Cicero, to the music of the poet's song, to the mellifluous language of Plato, and to the subtle reasoning of Aristotle. This we enjoy, but the Holy Bible is far too simple for our tastes. Women may be pleased with this, but not we. Preach to us in a tone of scholarly sublimity if you would be abreast of the spirit of the age."

It need astonish no one that tendencies so subversive of Christian principles and traditions should have been violently opposed by rigorous theologians and trained Schoolmen. Nor can any one fairly complain of such a course, or regard it as unfortunate. And if these champions of orthodoxy were sometimes carried beyond the bounds of legitimate warfare in their contemptuous denunciation of the new opinions, it should be borne in mind that they themselves did not escape the shafts of envenomed satire and fierce invective. Indeed, an antagonist with whom they might have occasional tilts was as indispensable to the Humanists of the fifteenth century as a lady-love to whom they might write amorous sonnets and say pretty things.[1]

---

[1] Discorsi sopra la prima Dec. di T. Livio; *Principe;* Storia Fiorentina. Conf. *Possevini* Judicium de Macchiavello. *Ribadeneira*, De principe Christiano adv. Macch. caeterosque huj. saec. politicos, Antv. 1603, and oftener. *Bozius Eugubinus*, lib. unus ctr. Macchiavellum, Colon. 1601. †*Artaud*, Macchiavelli, son génie et ses erreurs, Par. 1833, 2 T. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. VI., p. 712 sq.; French transl., Vol. 14, p. 69–76.

It can not, however, be denied that in the early days of the revival, classic studies exercised a beneficial influence in Germany, and were turned to good account by the *Brethren of the Common Life*, who, in their schools, made them a vehicle for conveying religious instruction.[2] With them, linguistic studies were made subservient to the attainment of a more complete and thorough knowledge of the Christian religion, which they regarded as the *sumnum bonum* and the end and object of all knowledge. In these schools did *Nicholas de Cusa*, and others equally or less eminent, receive the first rudiments of literary culture and scientific training.

Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (*the guest of popes and princes*), the most accomplished literary scholar of this epoch, used the philological knowledge thus acquired in illustrating the text of Holy Writ and making translations of the Fathers of the Church, doing for ecclesiastical literature what he had done at an earlier age for the Pagan classics.[3] Still, the same writer assailed in his work entitled "*The Praise of Folly*" (*ἐγκώμιον μωρίας*), with great severity, vigor of thought, and brilliancy of style, the ignorance of the monks, the degeneracy of the Monasticism, and the worthlessness of the Scholasticism of his age. He also deplored the menacing advances of Paganism, which exercised an extremely mischievous influence on himself, in blunting, and, in a measure, destroying in him his religious feeling and attachment to the Church. *Rudolph Agricola*, a native of Friesland and a professor at Heidelberg, who exercised a paramount influence in promoting the scientific culture of Southern Germany, did not allow his love of classic literature to estrange him from the Church. *Conrad Celtes*,[1] a professor at Vienna (1497), who published editions of many of the ancient authors, and was the first poet-laureate of *Germany* († 1508), was not less devoted to the Church than the Heidelberg professor. Equally loyal to Catholic principles were the Spaniard, *Louis Vivès* († 1540), and the Frenchman, *William Budaeus* († 1540, aged seventy-three years), who, with Erasmus, formed the famous literary triumvirate. Each of these three remarkable men was distinguished by a special gift. With Erasmus, it was a copious diction (*dicendi copia*); with Budaeus, a brilliant intellect (*ingenio*), and with Vivès, a mature judgment (*judicio*).[2] In England, also, there were such men as *Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester; *John Colet*, Dean of St. Paul's, London; *Lilly*, professor in the cathedral-school of St. Paul's, and *Thomas More*,[3] the statesman and faithful friend of Erasmus; all of whom united to an enlightened zeal for reform in morals and discipline a sincere love of antiquity and an ardent attachment to the Church.

---

[1] Cf. *Roscoe's* Lorenzo dei Medici (Germ., Vienna, 1817).

[2] *Delprat*, Over the Broederschap van G. Groote, Arnhem, (1830) 1856; with additions, by Mohnike, Lps. 1840.

[3] Especially Colloquium. Ciceronianus. Adagia. Epistolae. Moriae encomium. Enchir. militis Christ. Ratio verae Theol. Matrimonii chr. institutio. Ecclesiastes. *Novum Testamentum Graece; versio, annotationes, Paraphrasis N. T.*, best edition of *St. Augustine*, Berol. 1778–80, 3 T. 8vo. Conf. *Ad. Müller*, Life of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Hamburg, 1828. *Lieberkühn*, De Erasmi ingenio et doctrina, Jenae, 1836. *Durand de Laur*, Erasme précurseur et imitateur de l'esprit moderne, Paris, 1872, 2 vols.

§ 287. *The Study of the Holy Scriptures—Spread of the Bible among the People.*

†*Richard Simon*, Hist. critique des principaux commentateurs du N. T. *Rosenmüller*, Hist. interpretationis libror. sacror. in Eccles. Christ.; ed. II., Lps. 1814' 5 vols. *Meyer*, Hist. of S. Hermeneutics, Göttingen, 1802–1809, 5 vols. *Glaire*, Introd. à l'Écrit. s., IIIème ed., Par. 1861. *Dixon*, Introd. to the S. Script., Balt. 1853.

As Gerbert, in the tenth century, had laid the foundation of his vast erudition among the Arabs of Cordova, so now the Christians, stimulated by the labors of the *Jewish commentators of Spain*,[1] put aside, for a time, their Latin translations and applied themselves to the study of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, in the languages in which the various books were *originally* written, availing themselves of the philological researches of the age to acquire an accurate knowledge of the literal sense. The Church, far from discouraging, gave her most decided support to these efforts at a very early age. The Council of Vienne, held under Pope Clement V. in 1311, passed a decree providing for the foundation of chairs of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic, and Greek[2] at Rome, Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. It is indeed true that these were founded primarily with a view to facilitate the work of foreign *missions*, but it is equally true that their influence in promoting higher studies generally, and sacred hermeneutics in particular, was highly productive of good.

---

[1] *Tresling*, Vita et merita Rud. Agricolae, Groning. 1830. *Klüpfel*, De vita et scriptis Conradi Celti, etc., Frib. 1813–1829, XII. Partic.

[2] *Louis Vivès* deserves to be remembered on account of his celebrated commentary on St. Augustine's City of God, *De disciplinis*, of which there were many editions. Cf. Vol. I., p. 496, n. 2. Of the writings of *Budaeus*, the most deserving of study is his *De transitu Hellenismi ad Christianismum*, Paris, 1575.

[3] De optimo reipubl. statu deque nova insula Utopia. Cf. †**Rudhardt*, Thos. Morus, according to the sources, Nürnberg, 1829. *Thommes*, Thos. Morus, Lord Chancellor of England, Augsburg, 1847. Cf. *v. Redwitz*, Thos. Morus, a tragedy, act ii., scene 2.

The first great name in this department of study is *Nicholas de Lyra*,[3] a converted Jew, who afterward entered the Order of St. Francis, and became professor of theology at the University of Paris (*Postillator*, *Doctor planus et utilis*) [† 1341]. Nicholas, without entirely disregarding the *allegorical*, *moral*, and *anagogical sense*, gave special attention to the *literal* or grammatical and historical exposition of the Sacred Text, for which, by his thorough knowledge of the Oriental languages, he was so eminently qualified. His influence on *succeeding ages* is sufficiently attested by the familiar saying: "*Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset.*"

In the fifteenth century, *Alphonsus Tostatus*, a Doctor of the University of Salamanca, and subsequently Bishop of Avila († 1454), wrote exhaustive commentaries on nearly all the books of the Old Testament and on the Gospel of St. Matthew, in which he displays great erudition, and satisfactorily answers the objections of Spanish Jews. Tostatus was present at the Council of Basle when the decree of Vienne was confirmed and renewed. Measures were now taken to carry its instructions into effect.

---

[1] See p. 785.

[2] *Clement.* lib. V., Tit. I., c. 1 (Corp. Jur. Canon.)

[3] His principal work is Postillae perpetuae in biblia, Rom. 1471, 5 vols. f., best edition cura *Fr. Feuardentii*, *J. Dadrei* et *Jac. de Cuilly*, Lugd. 1590. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. VI., p. 688 sq.; French transl., Vol. 14, p. 39 sq.

Tiraboschi gives the names of several Italian Oriental scholars of the fifteenth century; among whom are the monk *James Philip of Bergamo*, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola*, *Palmieri*, *Giavozzo*, *Manetti*, and many more.

Shortly after the opening of the sixteenth century, *Agostino Giustiniano* went to work on his polyglot edition of the Psalms, and *Tesio Ambrogio* was appointed by Leo X. professor of the Oriental languages at Bologna.

In Spain, Cardinal *Ximenes*[1] published a polyglot Bible, containing Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and other versions. He also published dictionaries and grammars, specially prepared by Spanish scholars, to facilitate the acquiring of the biblical languages.

It should be borne in mind here, that these great efforts had been made before the time of *Reuchlin;* for, even in our own day, there are still people ignorant enough to assert that "Hebrew was almost unknown among Christians when he appeared upon the earth." In the very town of Tübingen, and contemporary with Reuchlin, flourished the Franciscan *Summenhardt*, *Paul Scriptoris*, and *Conrad Pelican*, all Hebraists. Even as early as 1505, *John Loeschenstein*, who had acquired a knowledge of Hebrew by his own efforts, and wholly independent of either Reuchlin or Pelican, was invited by Doctor Eck to teach Hebrew at Ingolstadt. But the scholarly and classic *Reuchlin*, who was indebted to *John Wessel* for his knowledge of Hebrew, should not be deprived of the honor of having greatly promoted the study of the original text of the Old Testament; although rabbinical lore was to him a much higher authority than the truths of Christianity.[2] This will explain why the converted Jew, *Pfeffer-*

---

[1] Biblia sacra; vetus testam. multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum, T. I.–V.; N. T., T. VI., Compluti, 1514–17, f. Conf. †*E. Fléchier*, Histoire du Card. Ximenes, Par. 1643, 2 T.; Germ. by *P. Fritz*, Würzb. 1828, 2 Pts. *J. de Marsolier*, Hist. du ministère du Card. Xim., Toul. 1694. **Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, and the condition of the Church in Spain at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, Tüb. 1844, p. 120–158.

[2] De verbo mirifico libb. III., Tüb. 1514, f. De arte cabbalist. libb. III., Hag.

korn,[1] Hogstraten, and the other *Dominicans of Cologne* carried their opposition to him to so violent an extreme as to demand that "all rabbinical books should be burnt." This opposition, however, was not provoked by jealousy, nor did it arise from any fear of what new lights might reveal, nor from a desire to check the growing interest in linguistic studies, but was directed solely against the undue importance attached to the learning of the rabbinists. Nay, more; *John Potken*, Provost of St. George's and one of the ablest Oriental scholars of that age, and *Ortwin Gratius*, equally eminent as a humanist and defender of the Dominicans, so far as their opposition was capable of defense,[2] both resided in Cologne, which, it was pretended, was the congenial home of obscurantism.

1517. De rudiment. hebr. Phorcae, 1506, f.; Bas. 1573, f. De accentib. et orthographia ling. hebr., Hagae, 1518, ff.; Epp., Hag. 1514. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., p. 233 sq.; French transl., Vol. 20, p. 194. *Mayerhoff*, Reuchlin and his Age, Berlin, 1830; *Lamey*, John Reuchlin, being a biographical sketch, Pforzheim, 1855; *Geiger*, John Reuchlin, his Life and his Works, Lps. 1871.

[1] *Pfefferkorn*, De judaica confessione, Colon. 1508. De abolendis scriptis Judaeorum. Narratio de ratione celebrandi Pascha apud Judaeos. Cf. *Hogstraten*, Destructio cabbalae seu cabbalisticae perfidiae adv. Reuchlinum, Antv. 1518. Contra dialogum de causa Reuchlini, et Apologiae contra Reuchlinum. Cf. *v. d. Hardt*, Hist. litter. Ref., Pars II. *Groene*, in the Tüb. Quart. 1862, nro. 1, p. 132–138.

[2] Against the *Epp. obscuror. viror.* (lib. I., Hagenau, 1516; lib. II., Basil. 1517; new editions, by *Münch*, Lps. 1827; by *Rotermund*, Hanov. 1830; by *E. Böcking*, Lps. 1858), Gratius wrote, by way of retaliation, the *Lamentationes obscur. virorum*, of which there were many editions, and but recently, another in a revised text, edited by *E. Böcking*, Lps. 1865. *Weislinger*, Huttenus delarvatus, i. e. a true account of the authorship of the *Epist. viror. obscur.*, with a history of the quarrel between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn, etc., Constance, 1730. New investigations on the authors of the *Epp. obsc. vir.*, by *Mohnike* (Journal of Hist. Theol. 1843, nro. 3, and in *Böcking*).

"The *Epp. obs. viror.* are a fictitious correspondence between *Ortuinus Gratius*, professor at Cologne, and his own and Pfefferkorn's friends. They are the production of a club of Erfurt humanists, and probably contain contributions from Crotus Rubianus, Mutian, Ulrich von Hutten, Eoban Hesse, and others. They are written in villainous monkish Latin, and supposed to portray the violence of party feuds and the private life and secret thoughts of monks, who are so unjustly assailed and so mercilessly ridiculed, that they have never quite recovered from the shock then sustained.

"The *Lamentationes obscurorum virorum*, as a reply, was feeble, and wholly inefficient. There can be no doubt that the Friar Preachers of Cologne, and their equally spiritless friends, the representatives and victims of an effete for-

That the zeal of the Dominicans against the study of the Oriental languages was extravagant and unenlightened, is evident from the rebuke of the Bishop of Spire, apostolic delegate of Leo X. (1514), who told them that the Church had at all times held the legitimate use of such study in highest esteem; and from the failure of Hogstraten to secure a reversal of this judgment in Rome.' It is to be regretted, however, that the Humanists abused their victory. They not only put into circulation libelous writings (*Epistolae obscurorum virorum*) concerning their adversaries, but one of them, *Ulrich of Hutten*, availed himself of the favorable occasion to boldly attack the Papacy.

We must not omit mentioning here the valuable services rendered by *Erasmus* to exegetics, by the *publication* of the Greek text of the New Testament, with a *translation*, a *paraphrase*, and short explanatory *notes*, for which he drew largely upon the labors of Greek expounders.

In France, the way was opened to an enlightened criticism by *Lefebvre d'Etaples* († 1537), who wrote commentaries on the Sacred Text, and made translations of it into the vulgar tongue. His freedom of interpretation[1] was in some instances so unwarranted as to incur ecclesiastical censure.

Although *approved translations* of the principal books of the Bible, which the Church has never prohibited,[2] had existed

---

malism, were in the wrong from the beginning to the end of this controversy. Moreover, it would seem that the motives of Reuchlin's conduct were above suspicion, for his loyalty to the Church was proof against even the seductive offers of Luther and of his own cousin, Melanchthon. But, on the other hand, as Pfefferkorn subsequently remarked, had it not been for the great scandal caused by the Reuchlin affair, it would never have entered into the heads and hearts of Luther and the disciples of the '*Obscurantists*' to attempt what they did, now openly and boldly, against the Christian faith." *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 431. (Tr.)

[1] James Faber, surnamed d'Etaples, from his birthplace, near Boulogne-sur-mer. His works are Psalterium quintuplex, Paris, 1509; Comment. in epp. Pauli, Paris, 1512; in IV. evang., Meld. 1522; French Bible, complete, in 1523, Antwerp, 1530, f.

[2] Hence the Catholic episcopacy of England publicly declared, in 1826 (see Vol. III., § 404), that "the Catholic Church has never either prohibited or hindered the reading of the Holy Scriptures in authentic versions, or in the original text. *Neither has the Church ever made a general law* forbidding the reading of

since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and were read by the people, the desire to acquire a knowledge of Sacred History, and the efforts put forth to supply this desire, had never been so manifest as in the present epoch. The printing-presses of France, England, Germany, and Italy were kept busy turning out complete editions of the Bible in the various vernaculars, to supply the growing popular demand.[1] In Germany alone, between the year 1460 and the moment when Luther made his appearance, there appeared at least fourteen editions of the Bible in the High German and five in the Low German dialect.[2] The assertion, therefore, that Luther was the first to extricate the Bible from the obscurity in which it had been so long concealed, to translate it into German and

---

approved translations of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue." This freedom has never been restricted, except in individual instances and particular localities, and then only because the restriction was justified by the spirit of the age. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who, in attempting to overthrow Church and State, *appealed to the Bible* in justification of their conduct, supply examples of our meaning. Those who cite the letter of Innocent III. (lib. II., ep. 141), as proving the contrary, seem ignorant of the fact that this Pope nowhere forbids the reading of a translation of the Bible; he simply admonishes the Bishop of Metz to examine and correct the translation in question. The Council of *Toulouse* (1229) and that of *Tarragona* (1234), under circumstances similar to those already referred to, forbade the use of the French translation, and the Church, for analogous reasons, employed the same caution in the sixteenth century; *but in no single instance did she ever prohibit* the reading of the Bible in the language of any country.

[1] A list of translations into different languages is found in *Lelong*, Bibliotheca sacra in binos syllabos distincta; subjiciuntur grammatica et lexica praesertim Orientalium, etc., Paris, 1723, 2 vols. fol. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. XII., p. 1210–14; French transl., Vol. 24, p. 14–20. **Reuss*, Hist. of the Holy Script. of the N. T., 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864, p. 440–519.

[2] The first edition appeared without either date or printer's name, but with the armorial bearings of Frederic III. (in 1460 or 62—probably at Mentz.) Other editions were published successively at Mentz, 1467; at Nürnberg, 1477, 1483, 1490, and 1518; at Augsburg, 1477, 1480, 1483, 1487, 1490, 1494, 1507, 1518, and 1524; at Strasburg, 1485. These editions, all in *High German*, are not reprints, but new translations. Editions of the Bible in Low German were published at Cologne between 1470–80; at Delft, 1477; at Gouda, 1479, and at Louvain, 1518; and in the Lower Saxon dialect, at Lübeck, 1494, and at Halberstadt, 1522. See *Panzer*, Literary notices of the most ancient German Bible in print, Nürnberg, 1774, and Hist. of the Roman Catholic Bible, in German, Nürnberg, 1781. *Kehrein*, Historical essay on German translations of the Bible *before* Luther, together with thirty-four different German translations of Matthew v., Stuttg. 1851.

bring it to the knowledge of his countrymen, is absolutely false, although he himself was not ashamed to lay claim to this honor. "It is as plain as the sun in the heaven," says he (Preface to his edition of the *German Theology*), "that nothing equal to this has for many a day been accomplished by the Universities, because there things have come to such a pass that the Word of God lies huddled away under the benches, dusty, forgotten, and worm-eaten."

We are now in a position to take a comprehensive view of this scientific revival. Let us, therefore, before passing judgment, try to appreciate at their true value the results of the *historical criticism* called into life by such men as *Nicholas de Cusa*, *Laurentius Valla*, *Antoninus*, Archbishop of Florence, *John*, Abbot of Trittenheim, and Canon *Cranz;* and the historical works of *Macchiavelli*, *Bembo*, *Guicciardini*, *Aeneas Sylvius*, and so many others. Having done this, we shall not merely own to a deep feeling of satisfaction, but we shall be struck with wonder and admiration at the stupendous progress made in every branch of *scientific culture*. Our *only* cause of regret will be that science, once so closely allied to the Church, should now revolt against her authority, and seriously impede the growth of spiritual life, by needlessly hastening a moral revolution, which, of its nature, moves stubbornly and slowly.

CHAPTER IV.

SPIRITUAL LIFE—WORSHIP—PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE.

§ 288. *Spiritual Life.*

Conf. **Gams*, The Saints of the Catholic Church during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (*Moehler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 36–52, with copious bibliography).

In treating of the spiritual life of the Church, Protestant historians have always been at special pains to ferret out, collect, and expose to public view whatever had the flavor of scandal or corruption, and not content with naked facts, they have, in many instances, exaggerated and misrepresented; but, as if things were still not exactly to their purpose, they have concealed *whatever of virtue the Church preserved in evil times*, and been silent when concealment was impossible. Faithful to our rule, we shall present facts fairly, and give praise and blame where they are deserved.[1]

The deplorable condition of the Papacy was quite as disastrous in its influence upon the spiritual life of the bulk of the faithful, as upon the body of the clergy. Throughout the whole of the great schism, men's minds were constantly torn by the strife of party conflict. Everything was unsettled. "Which is the true Pope?"—"How shall we recognize him?"—"Under whose obedience shall we range ourselves?"—were questions that were continually asked during those evil days, but never elicited a satisfactory reply. Religious feeling seemed about to perish from the earth, and the secular clergy and the monks alike were, in their actual condition, incapable of either preserving what still remained or reviving what had been lost. The glowing tender piety that in former days had warmed the hearts of the faithful had grown chill and lifeless; the vulgar *Meistersingers* had succeeded to the refined and lyric *Minnesingers*. *Superstition* sorcery, and *witchcraft*, in their various forms, had seized upon all, but particularly the lower and more ignorant classes of the people.[1] Simultaneously with the cultivation, in the fifteenth century, of *cabalistic* science by the Moors and Arabs, who were much addicted to *sorcery*, *magic*, *alchemy*, *astrology*, *theurgy*, and *necromancy*, were introduced superstitious practices among the Christians. *Petrarca* had early ridiculed the vagaries of the former; Pope *John XXII.* published a bull against alchemy; and the Sorbonne, at the instance of *Gerson*, condemned the manifold superstitions of the age in an instrument of twenty-eight articles. *Sixtus IV.* threatened with punishment any one who should have recourse to these illicit arts, and *Innocent VIII.* issued rigorous decrees against sorcery and appointed *Sprenger* and *Henry Institor* two special judges to try offenders in Germany, where the delusion was most widespread. The code enacted to try witches went by the name of the "*Witches' Hammer*" (*Malleus Maleficarum*), and the authorization for their condemnation was sought in the words of Leviticus xx. 27: "A man or woman in whom there is a pythonical or divining spirit, dying, let them die." Thousands of these deluded people expiated their folly at the stake.[2] The bulls issued by Popes to prevent such executions were as utterly disregarded and of as little effect as those published against the persecutors of the Jews. (See § 295.)[3] But, in the midst of this general decline, new orders and confraternities sprung up, won the affections of the people, made their influence felt, and prevented the religious sentiment from becoming wholly extinct. The faith, which the clergy had frequently neglected to preach to the people, was kept alive and fostered among them by the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the country. *John Tauler*, *Suso*, *Ruysbroch*, *Thomas à Kempis*, the Society of *the Friends of God*, and other mystics, edified the people of Germany by their exemplary lives; while their writings, composed, for the most part, in the vulgar tongue, made a powerful appeal to the noblest impulses of the heart. In Spain, *Vincent Ferrer*, the marvel of his own and succeeding ages, preached penance with such terrible vehemence as to again renew the extravagance of the Flagellants; and *John Capistran*, a Franciscan, led an equally marvelous life in Italy, Germany, and Hungary.[1]

---

[1] *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 392. (Tr.)

---

[1] *Hauber*, Bibliotheca, acta et scripta magica, Lemgo, 1739–43. *Horst's* Demonology, or Hist. of Sorcery and Satanic miracles, since Innocent VIII., 2 pts., Francf. on the Main, 1818. See also the Magic Library, by the *same*, Mentz, 1821–26; 6 pts. *Soldan*, Hist. of Witches' trials according to the sources, Stuttgart, 1843. *Bonn Journal* of Philos. and Cath. Theology, year 1844, nro. 1, p. 71 sq. Dr. *Haas*, The Trials of Witches, Hist. Essay on human Development, accompanied with Documents, Tubg. 1865. *Lecky*, Hist. of Rationalism in Europe, New York, 1866, 2 vols., ch. 1.

[2] Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. V., p. 155 sq.; French transl., Vol. 22, p. 301.

[3] Still more unfavorable traits, especially concerning the clergy, are delineated in *Zimmer's* Chronicle, published by *Barack*. See p. 1.

The number of men who lived during this epoch, and whom the Church has enrolled among her canonized saints, is very considerable.[2] Nothing can be more edifying or more characteristic of these times than the life of Brother *Nicholas of Flüe* among the Alps of Switzerland. Having done his duty by his native country, as a father, a warrior, and a civil magistrate, he was suddenly seized with a burning love and ardent desire for his heavenly home,[3] and, retiring into solitude, he held holy converse with his God, and for twenty years took no food other than the Holy Eucharist. He was constantly reciting this artless prayer: "O God, withdraw me from myself; make me wholly Thine; destroy in me whatever may alienate me from Thee." It was the old cry—"*Deserere creaturas, quaerere Creatorem.*" To the shepherds on the mountain-sides his presence was a heavenly apparition, and a beacon-light to those afar off. Keenly sensitive to the evils that afflicted the Church, he showed her the loyal and loving devotion of an humble child. In 1481 he effected, through his friendly mediation, the treaty of Stanz, and thus became an angel of peace to his divided fellow-countrymen.

---

[1] For the bibliography on both of them, see § 292.

[2] In the fourteenth century: Andreas Corsinus, Florentinus, episcop. Faesulanus; Joh. Nepomucenus, canonicus Pragensis; Peregrinus e Foro Livii, ordin. servor. B. Mariae; Conradus Placentinus, eremita of the Third Order of St. Francis; Rochus natione Gallus, sacris peregrinationibus devotus; Catharina, filia St. Brigittae, abbatissa; Catharina Senensis; Julia Falconeria Florentina; Elisabetha, Portugalliae regina; Elzearius comes et Delphina uxor ejus. In the fifteenth century: Joh. Cantius, presb. saecularis Cracoviae; Joh. a St. Facundo Augustinianus Salmanticensis; Didacus Franciscanus, Lay-brother; Nicolaus (of Flüe); *Casimirus*, of the royal family of Poland; Ferdinandus, of the royal family of Castile and Leon; Catharina Bononiensis, Clarissa; Veronica, an Italian Lay-sister; Coletta, virgo in Gallia; Ledwina, virgo in Hollandia; Francisca, matrona Romana, sancta vidua; Bernardinus Senens.; Antoninus, archiepiscopus Florentinus; Hemming, archiepiscopus Upsalensis, canonizatus A. D. 1513, et Nicolaus Suecensis, 1520.

[3] *John von Müller*, Hist. of the Swiss Confederacy, Vol. VI. †*Widmer*, Development of the divine element in the terrestrial element, proved by the example of Nicholas of Flüe, Lucerne, 1819; *Businger*, Brother Claus and his age, Lps. 1827. †*Görres*, God in Hist., Munich, 1831, 1st nro. †*Ming*, Blessed Brother Nicholas of Flüe, his Life and Influence, Lucerne, 1861 sq., 2 vols.

The influence of *St. Catharine of Siena* was still more efficacious for good, and exercised a great power upon questions the most vital to the well-being of the Church.[1] Born of poor parents, she was, from her tenderest years, given to the meditation of heavenly things, and was abundantly blessed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. She regarded the Dominicans as earthly angels appointed to protect her during life, and was so completely absorbed in the contemplation of our Savior's life that, like Nicholas of Flüe, she subsisted for months together upon the Bread of Life. *Next to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, her wide charity embraced the whole world, and yearned for its weal. All Italy flocked to her humble dwelling to consult her on their troubles and crave her mediation in allaying the bloody feuds of those disastrous times. Passing from a life of prayer and quiet to the bustle and distractions of the world, she was taken with catalepsy. An intimate communing with God, the uninterrupted presence of a heavenly atmosphere, were conditions of her being. She could not live without them. She died, in 1380, while pouring forth aspirations of the most tender love to her Heavenly Spouse. Her canonization was temporarily retarded by the objections of the Franciscans, but finally took place under Pius II. in 1461.

Another example and manifestation of the interior life of the Church in this epoch is St. Bridget, daughter of the King of Sweden; while the *Maid of Orleans* is a representative of the patriotic type of Christian heroes and heroines who, at intervals, rouse to the highest point the national energies of whole peoples.[1] It may be that the exclusive devotion of this heroic maiden to her country, or her premature death at the stake (Rouen, May 30, 1431), has prevented her being numbered among the saints of the Church. Be this as it may, her memory is enshrined and held in veneration by the gallant people of France, which she loved with a religious enthusiasm and freed from the ignominious yoke of England. Pope *Calixtus III.*, at the request of Charles VII., ordered a revision of the proceedings so iniquitously conducted by the University of Paris, to whose tender mercies she had been consigned by *Peter Cauchon*, Bishop of Beauvais, and the pliant tool of the English, which resulted in a reversal of the first verdict. Her memory was thus cleared of the charge, brought against her, of having superstitiously fancied divine revelations and then professed to believe in them.[2] Many monuments have been erected in her honor by the inhabitants of Orleans.

---

[1] See her Life in the *Bollandists*, mens Apr., T. III., p. 853 sq. Her Writings (Letters, Colloquies, Revelations), Ital. ed., by *Gigli*, Sien. 1707 sq., 5 vols. 4to. Cf. *Fabric.* Biblioth. med. et infirm. Lat., T. I., p. 363 sq. Her theology of Love, transl. Aix-la-Chapelle, 1833; *Poesl*, Life of St. Catharine of Siena, according to her biography, by her confessor, Raymond of Capua, General of the Dominicans, Passau, 1841. For further bibliography, see above, p. 844, note 1.

When we find characters such as these in every country of Europe, we think it may be safely affirmed that their energetic and united protest at the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle would have wrought, even in spite of the opposition of individual popes, a peaceable and steady reformation of abuses, much more speedily and more efficiently than did the terrible storms and insane excesses that characterized the opening of the succeeding period.

At the last council held in the Lateran, which closed in 1517, *Giles of Viterbo*, an Augustinian monk, pointed out the true principle of a fruitful reform. "It is," said he, "not lawful for man to change holy things, but to use them as instruments of his conversion (*Homines per sacra immutari fas*

---

[1] * *Guido Görres*, The Maid of Orleans, Ratisbon, 1834. Dr. *Strass* (Jurist), Jeanne d'Arc, Brl. 1862. **Eysell*, Johanna d'Arc, Ratisbon, 1864. *Hase*, The Maid of Orleans, Lps. 1861. * *Wallon*, J. d'Arc, 2d ed., Paris, 1867.

[2] **Guicherat*, Procès de condemnation et de réhabilitation de J. d'Arc, 5 vols., Paris, 1841-49. * *Vallet de Viriville*, Procès, etc., Paris, 1867. (Tr.)

est, non sacra per homines). The same fearless churchman thus addressed Pope Julius II.: "Your whole attention should be given to providing means for the improvement of morals, the advancement of spiritual life, the restraining of vice, luxury, and the propagation of error." Germany had more reason than perhaps any other country to look hopefully to the future; for, if the narrative of an unfriendly and even hostile historian may be trusted, she possessed a learned and virtuous episcopacy, among whom we find such eminent names as *John of Dalberg*, at Worms; *John Rhode*, at Bremen; *Lawrence of Bibra*, at Würzburg; *Conrad of Thungen*, and *Christopher of Stadion*, at Augsburg; *Matthias Lang*, at Salzburg, and the pious *Greifen*, at Treves. There was nothing, at this time, capable of accomplishing so much good as *the holding of synods at regular intervals*, and, unfortunately, nothing to which churchmen were less inclined.

§ 289. *History of the Older Religious Orders.*

Holstenius, Codex regular. monasticar., etc. The works of *Helyot*, *Biedenfeld*, *Henrion-Fehr*, and others. See bibliography heading, § 142. Cf. *Winter*, The Cistercians of North Germany, Gotha, 1871, Pt. III.

It is very evident from the canons of councils that the older religious orders had lost the spirit of their holy founders. To this, many causes contributed, but it may be ascribed chiefly to the disorders occasioned by the schism and the vast wealth of the monasteries, a great portion of which was accumulated between the years 1347 and 1350, when the Black Plague was desolating Europe, and people, in anticipation of death, bequeathed their property to the monks. As a consequence, the domestic life of monasteries underwent a complete change. Charity, wisdom, industry, and the love of science, which had formerly flourished in these retreats, were succeeded by luxurious living and relaxation of morals—disorders from which even female convents were not wholly exempt.

Nicholas de Clemange, sometimes more declamatory than truthful, has left the following startling account of the existing condition of affairs. "We might," he says, "use hard words of monks and nuns, were we not restrained by fear of giving scandal. By their vows they have laid upon themselves the duty of being the most exemplary of the Church's children—of cutting themselves off entirely from the world and its concerns, and giving themselves up wholly to a life of contemplation; yes, this is what they should be, but, unfortunately, they are exactly the reverse. They are the most sordid and the most ambitious of human kind. Instead of shunning the world, they seek it, and nothing is more repulsive to them than their cell and their cloister, reading and prayer, their Rule and their religious life."[1]

But, on the other hand, the Mendicant Orders present quite a different spectacle. Leading an active and self-sacrificing life, they also devoted themselves with enthusiastic ardor to scholastic studies, thus meriting and receiving the respect of all classes. The quarrel between the Franciscans and Dominicans grew daily less bitter, and was almost entirely forgotten when the two Orders entered upon two separate and wholly distinct spheres of action. The children of St. Dominic assumed the special office of defending Catholic doctrine against the attacks of heretics, and those of St. Francis devoted themselves chiefly to the work of comforting and serving the people. Among the latter, the *Spiritualists*, whom John XXII. pursued with relentless severity (1318), were the only element of disturbance. A party of them, led astray by *William Ockham*, under their general, *Michael of Cesena*, took sides against the Pope with the Emperor Louis the Bavarian; but, after the death of that prince, they were reconciled to the Church in the Council of Constance.[2] They were shortly approved as a branch of the Franciscan family, under the name of the *Brethren of the Strict Observance* (*Fratres regularis observantiae*), and consequently obtained more ample favors than even the *Conventualists* (*Fratres conventuales*). The stubborn adherence of these Orders to the degenerate Scholasticism of that age, and their intemperate zeal in branding the humanist or classical studies, so ardently pursued during the second half of the fifteenth century, as heretical, lost them their former prestige, and exposed them to the taunts and ironical flings of contemporary satirists.

---

[1] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De ruina eccl., c. 41 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. III., p. 33).

[2] Sess. XIX., in *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. IV., p. 515.

§ 290. *Reform of the Older Orders.*

Cf. *Joan. Busch*, De reformatione et visitat. monasterior., ed. *Leibnitz* (Scriptor. Brunsvicens., T. II.) **Pius Gams*, O.S.B., in Moehler's Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 607, "Reformed Benedictines."

The desire, so frequently expressed by councils, of seeing a reform in the head and members of the Church, naturally directed attention to the notorious *relaxation of discipline in the monasteries.* The *Council of Constance* ordered the Benedictines of Germany to hold a Provincial Chapter,[1] and the precedent thus set was approved and acted upon in many other countries. The *Council of Basle* took still more decided steps in the same direction, and Cardinal *Nicholas de Cusa*,[2] as papal legate, labored effectively in the cause of reform in Germany. The great source of evil and disorder in the monasteries was the practice of dividing and parceling out the property of the community among individual monks. Energy and decision were requisite to correct this abuse, but they were, as they will always be when properly employed, effective in spite of the opposition of guilty and interested parties. Moreover, there were many generous, self-sacrificing souls among the monks, who were uncompromising in denouncing the disorders of their more worldly brethren. *John Dederoth* (of Minden) introduced a reform into the Benedictine monastery of *Bursfeld*, near Gottingen, obliging the monks to a stricter observance of their Rule and to a life more in conformity with the spirit of their great founder; and to this *well-regulated* house many other monasteries of the same Order allied themselves.

When this great reformer died (1439), his work was taken up and carried to a successful issue by his successor, *John von Hagen* (1439–1469), whom the papal legates, *John Busch* and *Paul*, had fully imbued with their own spirit and sentiments.

---

[1] Conf. *Trithemii* chron. Hirsaugiense ad a. 1417, T. II., p. 346 sq. The Acts, *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. I., p. 1086. Conf. *Mansi.*, T. XXVIII., p. 1037.

[2] *Scharpf*, Vol. I., p. 156 sq. *Dux*, Vol. II.

Pope Pius II. was filled with joy when he heard of the exemplary condition of the Bursfeld monastery, and, in gratitude, conferred upon the house many rights and immunities.[1]

The houses of the Mendicant Orders, the last to yield to the prevailing relaxation of discipline and decline of morals, and whose devotion to scientific studies had long secured them a high place in public esteem, also underwent a reform.[2] The Council of Constance, in the hope of stimulating all branches of the Franciscan family to generous endeavor, expressed its preference for the stricter party of the *Conventualists;*[3] but, unfortunately, this appeal to their better nature, to their duty and sense of honor, was received in a spirit of cold indifference.

§ 291. *New Orders.*

Spiritual life, even in the worst seasons, never entirely dies out in the Church. When wants are felt, new Orders spring into life to supply them, and fresh energies are put into action.

The Order of *Olivetans*, or *Brethren of St. Mary of Mount Olivet* (*Congregatio Sanctae Mariae Montis Oliveti*), was founded in 1313, by *John Tolomei* of Siena, a distinguished professor of philosophy in his native city, in gratitude for the miraculous restoration of his sight. In company with a few companions, he established himself in a solitary olive-orchard, near Siena, obtained the approbation of John XXII. for his congregation, and, at the command of the latter, adopted the Rule of St. Benedict.[4]

The *Jesuates*,[5] so called from their custom of incessantly crying through the streets, "*Praised be Jesus Christ*," were founded by *John Colombino*, also a native of Siena. He was so fascinated by the lives of the Saints, particularly that of *St. Mary of Egypt*, that he resigned the highest civil preferment the State could offer, to give himself wholly to the service of the poor and the sick. *Urban V.*, on quitting Avignon to return to Rome, in 1367, approved the new congregation as a community of lay brothers, classed them among the Mendicant Orders, and ordered them to adopt the Rule of St. Augustine. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, permission was given to the Jesuates to take priests' orders; but the congregation was suppressed shortly after by Clement IX., because some of the houses of the wealthy *Padri dell' acqua vite*, as they were called, engaged in the business of distilling liquors and practicing pharmacy (1668).

---

[1] Cf. *Leuckfeld*, Antiquitates Bursfeldenses, or History of the former Monastery Bursfelde, Lps. 1713. †**Evelt*, The Beginning of the Congr. of Bursfeld-Benedictines, with a special regard to Westphalia, Münster, 1865. *Seiters*, in the *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. II., p. 221–223; French transl., Vol. 3, p. 387.

[2] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De ruina eccl., c. 33 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. III., p. 33).

[3] In *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. IV., p. 515 sq.

[4] Cf. *Raynald.* ad a. 1320, nr. 50. *Helyot*, l. c., Vol. VI., ch. 24, p. 225 sq. *Holsten-Brockie*, T. V., p. 1 sq.

[5] *Bolland*, Acta SS. mens. Jul., T. VII., p. 333 sq. *Helyot*, Vol. III., c. 55, p. 484 sq. *Poesl*, Life of St. Colomb. of Siena, Ratisb. 1846.

A number of solitaries residing among the mountains of Spain, Portugal, and Italy gradually formed into a community, and called themselves *Hieronymites*,[1] either because they had compiled their Rule from the writings of St. Jerome, or because, adopting the Rule of St. Augustine, they had taken St. Jerome for their patron. Their first superior in Spain was *Peter Ferdinand Pecha*, chamberlain to Peter the Cruel. The community was approved by Gregory XI., in 1374. The famous monastery of Our Lady of Guadaloupe, in Estremadura; the magnificent Escurial, with its wealth of literary treasures, and the monastery of *St. Just*, where Charles V. sought an asylum in the decline of his life, attest their wonderful energy and zeal. The community was first introduced into Italy by *Peter Gambacorta* (*Petrus de Pisis*). In the beginning, they took only two simple vows; but Pope Pius V., in 1568, ordered them to take solemn vows.

St. Bridget,[2] a descendant of the royal house of Sweden, while still fulfilling the duties of wife and mother, had affiliated herself to the Third Order of St. Francis, and, after the death of her husband, received divine *revelations*, which Gerson vehemently attacked, and the pontiffs, Gregory XI. and Urban VI., and the councils of Basle and Constance approved.

---

[1] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. III., p. 43; T. VI., p. 1 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 405 sq.

[2] *Brigittae* revelationes, ed. Turrecremata, Lub. 1492, Rom. 1628. The Life of St. Bridget (*Vaslovii* vitis Aquilonia s. Vitae SS. in Scandinavia, Col. 1623 f. c. notis *Erici-Benzel.*, Upsal. 1708). *Clarus*, The Life and Revelations of St. Bridget, 1856, 4 vols. The Life of St. Bridget of Sweden, by a Religieuse of the Perp. Adoration, Mentz, 1875. The Rule, in *Holst.*, T. III., p. 100 sq. *Helyot*, Vol. IV., ch. iv., p. 29 sq.

In one of these revelations, she was instructed by Our Lord to found a new Order, and accordingly built a monastery at *Wadstena*, in 1363. The Order was approved by Pope Urban V., in 1370, under the name of the *Order of St. Bridget, or Our Savior* (*Ordo Stae Birgittae seu Salvatoris*), and became, for the countries of Northern Europe, an abundant source of graces and blessings (†1373). Every house of the Order recognized the supreme authority of the abbey of Wadstena, into which only sixty religious were received, whose spiritual care was intrusted to three priests and four deacons, while ten lay brothers looked after their temporal affairs. The whole number of monasteries corresponded to that of the thirteen (including Paul) Apostles and seventy-two disciples.

Finally, *Francis de Paula*,[1] a native of the little town of Paula, in Calabria, was also the founder of an Order. Impelled by a holy rashness, he sought to follow Our Lord in His poverty more closely than did the children of St. Francis, and retiring into solitude, in the neighborhood of his native town, he so macerated his body that he was oblivious of all that was going on about him, and, strange to say, his countenance was withal fresh and cheerful.

In 1457 and succeeding years, he gathered about him a number of followers, fired with his own zeal and love of suffering, who, surpassing even the Minorites in the rigor of their penances, called themselves *Minims*. The heavenly piety of these monks, their angelic purity, and the miracles of their founder, raised their reputation so high, that they spread rapidly through Italy, France, and Spain, particularly after the Order had been approved by Sixtus IV., in 1474 (*Ordo Minimorum fratrum Eremitarum, fratrum Francisci de Paula*). In the course of a journey to France, undertaken by Francis for the purpose of attending at the deathbed of Louis XI., he was everywhere received with triumphal honors, and everywhere left behind him tokens of his virtue and gift of healing. He predicted the king's death, saying: "Set thy house in order, for thou wilt die, and not live." Leo X. completed the joy of the Minims by canonizing, in 1519, their holy founder, St. Francis, who died in 1507. The principal house of the Order, in Rome, is at Sant' Andrea delle Fratte; there is also another, called San Francesco di Paola, adjoining San Pietro in Vincoli.

---

[1] *Bolland.* Acta SS. mens. Apr., T. I., p. 103 sq.

§ 292. *Independent Associations.*

When treating of the preceding epoch, we traced the origin and rise of the Beghards and Beguines (§ 250), whose heretical opinions and erratic lives exposed them to persecution in the present. Still, these independent associations found favor in Germany and the Low Countries, and as their influence upon society was highly beneficial, they received, after being organized on a new basis, and in a more perfect form, the approbation of the Church. *Gerard Groot of Deventer* († 1384), who had had a large experience, and well understood the needs of his eminently practical countrymen, established an independent association of the clergy in Holland, known as the *Clergy and Brethren of the Common Life* (*Clerici et fratres vitae communis*). He had been educated at Paris, had lectured on theology with distinguished success at Cologne, and finally obtained important ecclesiastical benefices;[1] but, wearying of the worldliness he saw everywhere about him, he began to lead a more austere, though not less active life. His experience as a preacher of penance had made him familiar with the needs of the people and the poverty of the clergy, and to provide for both he dedicated his entire fortune, which was considerable, to the foundation of an institute, whose members were to be, in a special sense, the imitators of the Apostles, earning their bread by the labor of their hands, and teaching holiness of life by lesson and example. The monastery of the *canons regular* at *Windesheim*, founded in 1386 by *Florence Radewijes*, became the headquarters of these associations, which, in the manner of the Beghards and Beguines, included among their members lay persons of both sexes, and existed in considerable numbers in the Low Countries and Westphalia. In the latter country, the members prudently introduced among their exercises scientific, and especially *philological* studies; and it is worthy of note that *Thomas à Kempis* and *Gabriel Biel*, the last of the sententiaries, were of their number. The better classes of the clergy, to escape the contagion of the prevalent disorders, sought refuge in these spiritual confraternities, to which numerous privileges were granted by Popes Eugene IV. and Paul II.

---

[1] His Life of Thomas à Kempis (Opp. ed. Sommalius, Antv. 1607, 4to, p. 765). Chronicon collegii Windeshemensis, ed. *Rosweyd*, lib. I., c. 3. *Joan. Busch*, De origine coenobii et congregat. Windeshemensis. — *Delprat*, over de Broederschap van G. Groot, Utrecht, 1830, Arnheim, 1856; transl. by Dr. *Mohnike*, Lps. 1840. Cf. *Ullmann*, John Wessel, Hambg. (1834) 1842, Append. I.

§ 293. *Worship during This Epoch* (1073–1517).

Ivo Carnot., see heading of § 201. *Ruperti Tuitiens.*, De divinis officiis, lib. XII.; **Guil. Durandi*, Episc. Mimatens. (better, *Duranti* †1296) Rationale divinor. officior., libb. VIII., many edit., and Ven. 1609, 4to. The general works of *Mamachi*, *Selvaggio*, *Pelliccia*, *Martene*, De antiquis eccl. ritibus, and *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. V., Pt. I.

The tendency and elevation imparted to the Church by Gregory VII., in her external relations, were not without their influence upon her interior life, and, as a consequence, worship assumed a more imposing, impressive, and mysterious character. After the crusaders returned from the East, where they had had an opportunity of admiring the temples of Greece and Asia, they were desirous of producing something comparable or superior to them. Moreover, the great bulk of the people were ardently attached to the *feasts of the Church.* From a long catalogue of them, drawn up, in 1229, by the Council of Toulouse, and a still longer one by the Council of Oxford,[1] in 1222, we learn that, in those days, about one-fourth of the year was dedicated to the service of God; and yet, strange to say, we hear nothing of the famine and misery of which modern political economists have, or pretend to have, so much dread, if a few days be set apart in honor of Him who is the Lord of all.

---

[1] Cf. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 180, and 117; *Mansi*, T. XXIII. Cf. also T. XXVI., p. 417, and, finally, *Durandi* Rationale, lib. VII., c. 7. *Binterim*, Hist. of German councils, Vol. VI., p. 534 sq.

In this, as in every previous and succeeding age, the *Sacrament of the Altar* was the source of religious inspiration, the object of religious enthusiasm, and the sun in the firmament of Catholic worship. "Here," says Innocent III.,[1] "all is mystery; from this source a heavenly sweetness goes forth. Three languages are used in the Mass (Latin, which is the ordinary language; Greek, in the words κύριε ἐλέησον; ἅγιος, ἀθάνατος; and Hebrew, in the words Allelujah, Hosanna, and Amen), that the Father may be honored in the acknowledgment of the divinity of Jesus Christ, and to recall the three languages in which the title on the Cross was written."

The greatest thinkers of every age have given their best energies to the consideration of this Mystery, and the first masters of spiritual life have strenuously exerted themselves to excite the proper sentiments in those who partake of It. The *elevation* of the consecrated Host, first introduced as a protest against the heresy of Berengarius, now became general; and the practice of ringing a small bell to call attention to the act, derives its origin from Cologne, where it was introduced by the authority of the papal legate, Guido, who also directed that the presence of the Blessed Sacrament should be indicated by the same sign when It was being carried to the sick.[2] *Tubernacles, monstrances* (*ostensoria*), and *pyxes* for preserving, exposing, and carrying the Blessed Sacrament, also came into general use about this time.

---

[1] *Innocent III.* composed on the Eucharist a work, very remarkable for those times, and having for its object the explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass. It bears the title, "Mysteriorum missae" libb. VI. (Germ. by *Hurter*, Schaffh. 1845); a second ed. appeared later on.

[2] *Caesarius Heisterbacensis* said about 1225 (De Miraculis et visionib. sui temp. dialog., lib. IX., c. 51): "Tempore schismatis inter Philippum et Othon. dominus Wido Cardinalis — cum missus fuisset Coloniam (a. 1203) ad confirmandam electionem Othonis, bonam illic consuetudinem instituit: praecepit enim, ut ad elevationem Hostiae omnis populus in ecclesia ad sonitum nolae veniam peteret, sicque usque ad calicis benedictionem prostratus jaceret. Praecepit etiam idem Cardinalis, ut quoties deferendum esset ad infirmum, scholaris sive campanarius sacerdotem praecedens per nolam illud proderet, sicque omnis populus tam in stratis quam in domibus Christum adoraret." Honorius III. made this a positive law (Decretal. Greg., lib. III., tit. XLI., c. 10).

All the arts vied with each other in celebrating the Blessed Sacrament; paintings the most perfect, and hymns the most divine, inspirations of Christian genius and love, were laid upon the altar by the gifted and noble sons of the Church. In Spain, in Bohemia, and in Poland, thanks to the exertions of Gregory VII., the Mozarabic and Slavic liturgies were replaced by the Roman, which was regarded as a public sign and symbol of that union which every church must have with the See of St. Peter.[1]

Even in the preceding epoch, a fear, arising from feelings of profound reverence toward the Blessed Sacrament, began to be entertained that the general use of the chalice might be the occasion of accidents saddening to every pious soul. These feelings deepened and became more general as time went on, and were strengthened by the teachings of the most eminent of the Schoolmen, who held that the Body of our Lord was wholly contained under *either species*, and that, as a consequence, the faithful, in receiving the Body, received also the Precious Blood (*concomitantia corporis et sanguinis*). From this time forth, the ancient usage was gradually discontinued.*

---

[1] *Gregor.* VII. ep., lib. VII., ep. 11 (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1434). On the reproaches made to the popes with respect to their efforts to improve public worship, see the *Tübing. Quart.* 1844, nro. 4.

* *Alexand. Halesius* (in Sent., lib. IV., quaest. 53, membr. 1) answers the question: Utrum liceat sumere corpus Christi sub specie panis tantum, etc.: "Dicendum, quod quia Christus integre sumitur sub utraque specie, bene licet sumere corpus Christi sub specie panis tantum, sicut fere ubique fit a laicis in Ecclesia." The chief objection urged against withholding the chalice, claims that the Body of Our Lord is present sub specie vini, non sacramentaliter, sed tantum ex unione naturali, and therefore communion *sub una specie* seemed to be imperfect; but *St. Thomas Aquinas* replaced the words, *unio naturalis*, of Albertus M., by those of *concomitantia realis* s. *naturalis*. *St. Bonaventure* is still more explicit. The former says in his Summa, Pt. III., qu. 76, art. 1: "Omnino necesse est confiteri secundum fidem cathol., quod totus Christus (i. e. divinitas, anima et corpus) sit in sacramento. Sciendum tamen, quod aliquid Christi est in hoc sacramento dupliciter: uno modo quasi ex vi sacramenti, alio modo ex naturali concomitantia. Ex vi quidem sacramenti est sub speciebus hujus sacramenti id, in quod directe convertitur substantia panis et vini praeëxistens, prout significatur per verba formae, quae sunt efficativa in hoc sacramento: — ex naturali autem concomitantia est in hoc sacramento illud, quod realiter est conjunctum ei, in quod praedicta conversio terminatur. Si enim aliqua duo sunt realiter conjuncta, ubicumque est unum realiter, oportet et aliud esse. Artic. 2: Sub utraque specie

Robert, Bishop of Liege, was the first to give full expression to the profound and universal sentiment of devotion toward the adorable Sacrament of the Altar, by instituting, in 1246, a special feast in its honor (*Festum Corporis Christi*). The occasion of this action was a vision of the nun *Juliana of Retinna*, in which she beheld the moon shining with brilliant effulgence, but darkened in one spot, which, she said, denoted the absence of a feast specially dedicated to the Blessed Sacrament, and shut out much light from the Church.[1] A circumstance equally strange led Pope Urban IV. to give his approbation to the feast. In 1264, while a priest was celebrating *Mass in Bolsena*, near Orvieto, some drops of the consecrated wine accidentally fell upon the corporal. The celebrant, desirous of concealing the negligence from those about him, folded the linen corporal several times, but the Sacred Species, passing through all the folds, left a blood-stain on each. The corporal may still be seen at Orvieto, where it is preserved, and the circumstance itself has been made the subject of one of Raphael's pictures in the "Stanze" of the Vatican. In 1311, the Ecumenical Council of Vienne extended the feast to the whole Church, with the remark, however,

---

sacramenti totus est Christus, aliter tamen et aliter. Nam sub speciebus panis est quidem corpus Christi ex vi sacramenti, sanguis autem ex reali concomitantia, sicut supra dictum est de anima et divinitate Christi. Sub speciebus vero vini est quidem sanguis Christi ex vi sacramenti: corpus autem Christi ex reali concomitantia." Cf. quaest. 80, art. 12. And by *Bonaventure* in Sent. lib. IV., dist. II., Pt. II., art. I., qu. 2, the question—An utraque species sit de integritate sacramenti—is thus answered: "Esse de integritate Sacramenti *dupliciter* est: aut quantum ad efficaciam, et sic neutra species est de integritate, sed quaelibet est totum, quod habet efficaciam; aut quantum ad signationem vel significationem, et sic sunt de integritate, quia in neutra per se exprimitur res hujus sacramenti, sed in utraque simul. — Ideo fideles recipiunt perfectum sacramentum sub una specie, quia ad efficaciam recipiunt. Sed quantum ad significantiam sufficit, quod Ecclesia facit in eorum praesentia, nec oportet, quod ipsi recipiant, propter periculum effusionis et propter periculum erroris, quia non crederent simplices in alterutra specie totum Christum recipere."

[1] *Barthol. Fisen*, Origo prima festi corp. Chr. ex viso virgini Julianae divinitus oblato, Leod. 1619, 8vo. Cf. *Bzovii* annal. eccl. a. 1230, nr. 16. Acta SS. ed. *Bolland.* m. April., T. I., p. 437 sq. *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 1077. Bullarium magn. Roman. ed., Lugd. 1712, T. I., p. 146. *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. V., Pt. I., p. 275. *Bartholet*, Hist. of the Establishment of the Feast of Corpus Christi, together with the Life of Juliana. Transl. from the Fr. into Germ. by *Vecqueray*, Coblenz, 1847.

that Holy Thursday, being within a season of mourning, was not a fit day to celebrate it.[1] The feast called forth all the pomp and splendor of the Church's ritual, and, to contribute to its worthy celebration, St. Thomas Aquinas wrote the incomparable office *Sacerdos magnus*, and the equally incomparable hymns, *Pange lingua*, *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, *Adoro te devote latens deitas*, and *O esca viatorum.* Moreover, apart from being a direct expression of faith and love, this feast, so dear to every Catholic heart, was also, by the outward and visible recognition of the Real Presence, a pointed protest, and an evidence of a reaction, against the various sectaries who denied the dogma. The practice of carrying the Blessed Sacrament about in processions subsequently became so general that it was found necessary to place it under certain restrictions.[2]

The feast of the *Immaculate Conception* was also instituted about this time. It was first celebrated, in 1140, by the canons of Lyons, who, acting without ecclesiastical sanction, were rebuked by St. Bernard. Through the exertions of the Franciscans it was rapidly introduced among the people, by whom it was joyfully received. The Dominicans in a body[3] assailed the doctrine, and the controversy between the two Orders, gaining in acrimony and intensity as time went on, called eventually for the interposition of papal authority.[4] This deep and pervading tendency to honor the Blessed Virgin found expression in still another feast—namely, the *Visitation*—which St. Bonaventure has the honor of instituting and *Urban*

---

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* continuat. annal. Baron. ad an. 1264, nro. 26; *Benedict.* XIV. Commentar. de festis Domini Jes. Chr., T. I., p. 212; *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXVIII., p. 79 sq., incorrectly gives the cathedral of Civita Vecchia in place of that of Orvieto.

[2] Cf. *Binterim*, Hist. of Germ. Counc., Vol. VII., p. 531 sq.

[3] Dr. *Alzog* says that St. Thomas also attacked this doctrine; a statement which we have disproved on a preceding page (p. 782, Rem.) (Tr.)

[4] *Bernardi* ep. 174, ad Canonicos Lugdun. The quarrel between the two orders gained in importance when the council of Basle declared in its thirty-sixth session: "Immaculatan conceptionem B. M. V. tanquam piam et consonam cultui ecclesiastico, fidei catholicae, rectae rationi et sacrae scripturae, ab omnibus Catholicis approbandam, tenendam et amplectendam." (*Harduin.*, T. VIII., p. 1266.) The question was still discussed during the following Period.

VI.[1] extended to the whole Church in 1389. Finally, the inhabitants of *Loreto*, near Ancona,[2] and of *Zell*, in Styria, with a view to perpetuating holy traditions, and to give expression to their grateful love, erected magnificent basilicas in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

About this time, also, was introduced the feast of the *Most Blessed Trinity* (*festum SS. Trinitatis*), or the last of the ecclesiastical year, whose origin, unlike that of all other feasts, is immediately connected with no historical fact,[3] and seems to have been the outgrowth of cumulative religious conviction and feeling. In preceding ages, this underlying truth of Christianity, recalled by every ceremony of the Church, constantly reiterated at the close of every prayer, and specially consecrated by the sanctification of Sunday and the celebration of the great feasts throughout the year, did not seem to stand in need of any explicit recognition or solemnization; but from the twelfth century onward, particular churches—notably those of Liége and Arles—began to give distinct prominence to the mystery of the Trinity as the complement and crowning expression of *the three chief Christian feasts*, and as being intimately connected with that of Pentecost. Once brought distinctly before the faithful, it rapidly grew in favor, and was extended to the whole Church in 1334, as a feast of second rank (*festum secundae classis*) by Pope John XXII. *Boniface VIII.* raised the feasts of apostles, evangelists, and of SS. Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, the four great doctors of the Church, to the rank of what are known in ecclesiastical language, as doubles (*festa duplicia*).

The feast of the *Transfiguration of Our Lord*, August 6th (*μεταμώρφοσις τοῦ κυρίου*), was in the West only a *festum chori*, or one observed by the clergy of chapters; while in the East it was one of the twelve great feasts of the year, a *festum fori*, or one of obligation. *Potho Prun*, a monk of the twelfth century, expresses his astonishment that such a feast should ever have been instituted. It has been celebrated in the Western Church since the year 1457, when it was formally established by Calixtus III. in thanksgiving for the victory gained over the Turks near Belgrade in 1456.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Bzovii* ann. ad a. 1389, nr. 2. Cf. *Binterim*, in l. c.

[2] *Horatius Turselinus*, Lauretanae hist. libb. V., Rom. 1597, and oftener.

[3] *Baluz.*, Papae Aven., T. I., p. 177; cf. not., p. 793. *Benedict.* XIV., De festis Christi et Mariae, lib. I., c. 13 (opp. T. X., p. 360). *Launoi*, Hist. acad. Navar. II., p. 473. Cf. *Bonn Periodical*, nro. 13, p. 133 sq.

The pomp and splendor of the ceremonial employed in the celebration of these feasts were greatly enhanced by the glorious *hymns* of the gifted sons of the Church, which, while adding to the collection of former ages, were among the proudest triumphs of the present.[2] The praises of the name of Jesus were sung in pious and mellifluous language by *St Bernard*, in his canticle *Jesu dulcis memoria*, and his tender and child-like love of the Blessed Virgin, found expression in the hymn *Dilatare, aperire. Thomas of Celano* († 1220), a disciple of St. Francis, is the author of the DIES IRAE, that sublime elegiac dirge of the Church; and another Franciscan, *Jacopona* († 1306), contests with *Innocent III.* the authorship of the *Stabat Mater*, the most beautiful and truthful expression of a pure and holy sorrow that ever human mind conceived.

A new feature was now introduced into the hymnology of the Church, due chiefly to the influence of confraternities. While the Latin hymns were still retained in the general liturgy, and sung, on the greater feasts, side by side with them, sprung up in the church of almost every nation, a national church-song in the vulgar tongue, consisting partly of translations of Latin hymns and partly of original productions. In Germany, however, compositions of this character may be traced back all the way to St. Boniface. They became more numerous in the twelfth century, and it is evident, from a document bearing the date of 1323, that hymns were sung in the vulgar tongue, during divine service, in Bavaria.[3]

---

[1] *Potho*, De statu dom. Dei, l. 3. *Raynald.* ad an. 1457, nro. 23. *Freiburg* Cyclopaedia, Vol. XI., p. 129. French transl., Vol. 24, p. 27. (TR.)

[2] Cf. *Daniel*, Thesaurus hymnologicus sive hymnor. canticor. sequentium circa a. 1500 usitatorum, etc., Hal. 1841 sq., T. I. (hymni), T. II. (sequent. cant. antiphonae), and the collections of ecclesiastical hymns, by †*Mohne. Schlosser*, quoted on p. 786, note 4. *Simrock*, Lauda Sion, Cologne, 1850. †*G. Morel*, Lat. hymns of the M. A., Our Lady of Hermits, 1866.

[3] *Hoffmann*, Hist. of German church-song before Luther, Breslau, 1832; 2 ed., Hanover, 1854. *Wackernagel*, German church-song, from the most ancient times

Nearly contemporaneously with the invention of the art of printing appeared many collections of hymns translated from the Latin, and German canticles and popular songs, which are still extant.

As prayer-books had not yet come into general use, their place was supplied by the *Rosary*, which was connected by the Dominicans with the main facts of Christian faith, *the mysteries of Redemption*, and with the *glories of the Mother of God.*[1] After the great victory of *Lepanto* (October 7, 1571), gained by Don Juan of Austria, on the very day that the *confraternities of the Rosary* were going round on pilgrimages, and performing special devotions in Rome, to propitiate the God of battles in favor of the Christians, *Pius V.* formally established the *feast of the Holy Rosary.* The day for its celebration was fixed on the first Sunday of October by *Gregory XIII.*, and *Clement XI.* extended it to the whole Church.

Those ceremonial and other provisions, tending to heighten the effect of public worship and increase its efficiency, were supplemented by instructive and earnest *sermons*, which still further promoted its utility and contributed to keep a living and active faith aglow in the hearts of the faithful.

Richard of St. Victor (c. A. D. 1164), in a sermon delivered on Easter Sunday, said that it was not his intention to instruct his hearers, but simply to recall truths and facts to their minds; because, he added, they knew the teaching of Holy Scripture as well as himself.

At the close of this period (1503), we meet the remarkable statement that "preaching contributes more than anything else to the conversion of man, excites him to penitence,

---

to the seventeenth century, Lps. 1863. *Hoelscher*, German church-singing before the Reformation, together with ancient melodies, Münster, 1849. †*Kehrein*, Church-songs, hymns, and psalms from the most ancient printed Song and Prayer-books, Würzburg, 1859 sq., 3 vols. †*Meister*, The German Catholic Church-singing, together with the melodies, Freiburg, 1862. For Poland, *Oloff*, Hist. of song in Poland, in his Essays on the political, ecclesiastical, and literary History of Poland, Danzig, 1764, 2 pts.

[1] Cf. the bibliography given above, p. 398, note 2, and Manual of the devotion of the Rosary, transl. from the French into Germ. by *Axinger*, Augsburg, 1843.

thereby securing pardon of mortal sins, while the Sacrifice of the Mass effaces only venial sins."[1]

Among the most eminent preachers of those times may be reckoned *St. Yves of Chartres*, *St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, *Hildebert of Mans*, *Godfrey of Bordeaux*, *Gilbert de la Porrée*, *Abelard*, *St. Bonaventure*, *St. Thomas Aquinas*, and many more of the Schoolmen, who put aside, for the time, the rigorous forms of the schools, and, while instructing the people, employed language the most simple and the best calculated to convey to their minds a clear and intelligible idea of the matter in hand. The members of the Order of St. Dominic gave their special attention to pulpit eloquence, and one of their number—*John of Vicenza*—rose to the first rank of preachers, a distinction which he might have retained to the close of his life had he not allowed himself to be overcome by the temptation of mingling politics with religion (c. A. D. 1230).

At a still earlier day, *Fulco, curé of Neuilly*, had stirred the heart of the French people to its depths, and roused them to make new exertions and fresh sacrifices to reconquer the Holy Land. In Germany, the Franciscan, *Berthold* († 1272), softened even the hardest hearts, and excited in them feelings of compunction.[2] The biographer of *St. Anthony of Padua*, surnamed the "Ark of the Covenant," says, in speaking of his sermons: "They were flames of fire impossible to withstand, which roused numbers of sinners and criminals to penitence."

As was natural in an age when great preachers abounded, there were not wanting directions as to the best method of rendering preaching fruitful in good results. Treatises were written on the subject by *Alanus of Ryssel* and *Abbot Guibert of Nogent* († 1124). The latter requires a preacher to have a pure conscience, an elocution energetic and impetuous, and a plain and familiar speech. Such was the method followed in instructing the people by Humbert, a native of Romans, in the diocese of Vienne, and General of the Dominican Order († 1277). *St. Bonaventure,* in his exposition of the Bible (*Biblia pauperum omnibus praedicatoribus perutilis*), intended to serve as an aid to inexperienced and ignorant preachers of the Word of God, makes war on all tricks and devices resorted to by pulpit speakers for effect, declaring that their one aim and purpose should be to gain souls and give glory to God. The same principles were urged by the Dominican, *John of Runsch,* called *Johannes Friburgensis.*[1]

---

[1] See *Surgant*, Manuale curatorum. Unfortunately an impartial history of mediaeval preaching has still to be written. One can find very interesting information on the subject in the theological controversies of *Daniel*, ch. VIII., p. 73 sq., especially p. 80, note *, against *Guericke;* in Innocent III., Vol IV., p. 501–510; in *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXIX., p. 211–330; *Kerker*, in Tübg. Quart. 1862, nro. 2, p. 267–301, and *Moehler's* Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 71 sq.

[2] *Kling*, Sermons of the Franciscan, Berthold, partly unabridged and partly epitomized, Berlin, 1824, new transl. and ed. by †*Göbel*, Schaffhausen, 1851, 2 pts., 2d ed., 1857. Complete ed. of his sermons, accompanied with annotations and dictionary, by *Pfeiffer*, Vienna, 1862 sq. *Grieshaber*, German sermons of the thirteenth century, Stuttgart, 1844–46, 2 vols.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, particular districts were blessed above others by the presence of eminent and holy preachers. Such was the effect produced upon his hearers by *John Tauler* († 1361), at Cologne and Strasburg, that contemporary writers own to an inability to convey an idea of it.[2] This humble expounder of the Word of God, having observed, during the early days of his career as a preacher, that the proud consciousness of *his own* ability and his great erudition prevented the truths that he proclaimed from sinking into the hearts of his hearers and bearing fruit, ceased to preach for two years, and during the interval occupied himself in meditating on the life of our Savior and the practice of self-denial.

Vincent Ferrer, as affable and tender to others as he was harsh and severe to himself, by his eloquent sermons and exemplary life, brought numbers of heretics back to the Church.[3]

---

[1] *Guibertus,* liber, quo ordine sermo fieri debeat. *Humbertus de Romanis,* De eruditione praedicator. libb. II. *Johannes Friburgensis,* Summa praedicator. et confessarior., Lugd. 1518, 4to.

[2] Sermons of *John Tauler,* for all the Sundays and festivals of the year (translated into modern book-language, by Schlosser, Frcft. 1826, 3 pts.); ed. by the Protestants *John Arnd* and *James Spener*; new ed. by the Protestant preacher, *Kunze,* and *Dr. Biesenthal,* Berlin, 1841, 3 pts.

[3] *Heller,* St. Vincent Ferrer, Berlin, 1836. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. IV., p. 39–41. French transl., Vol. 8, p. 461–464.

Such was the wonderful success of his preaching among people of various nationalities, that he was popularly believed to have received the gift of tongues, of which he knew only Spanish and Latin; and his angelic life was so close an imitation of the life of Christ, that, when he came to Vannes, the inhabitants cried out, "*Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord*." He was not in the least elated by his splendid success, was uniformly humble and unassuming, and led a most austere life, not unfrequently scourging himself.

John Capistrano[1] was equally successful in combating the Hussites in Bohemia. His sermons were delivered in Latin, and then translated and explained by an interpreter, who accompanied him on his journeys. He has also gained a name in profane history by his zealous and efficient labors in preaching a crusade against the Turks.

The fiery energy and resistless eloquence of *Jerome Savonarola*, his apocalyptic imagery and fervid language, subdued all hearts.[2]

Gailer of Kaisersberg had hardly been called to a religious life, before he began to assail with unusual vehemence the follies of the world and the abuses in the Church, particularly in his famous satirical work, entitled *Brand's* Vessel of Fools. According to the very appropriate custom of the age, he was buried under the pulpit of Strasburg minster, the scene of his labors and triumphs († 1510).[3]

This style of preaching was carried to still greater excess by *Gabriel Barletta*, a Neapolitan monk, who flourished about the last quarter of the fifteenth century.[1]

---

[1] His first biography is by P. *Sedulius* (historia Seraphica); when *Wadding*, in his ann. ordin. Minor., had published numerous documents, then appeared Capistranus triumphans s. historia fundamental. de St. J. Capistrano, etc., auctore P. F. *Amand. Hermann.* ord. Minor. strictae observ., Col. 1700, Germ., Munich, 1844. Cf. *Bonn Periodical*, nros. 21 and 22. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. II., p. 622–624; French transl., Vol. 4, p. 3–6.

[2] The list of his sermons is found in *Meier*, l. c., p. 393 sq.; his most remarkable works are: In oration. Domini expositio quadruplex, Par. 1517; Compendio di rivelazioni, Firenze, 1495, 4to, and Flor. et Par. 1496, 4to; De simplicitate vitae chr., Flor. 1496, 4to; **Triumphus crucis*, s. de veritate fidei, Flor. 1497, 4to.

[3] Mirror of the World, or Sermons on the Mad Vessel of Sebastian Brand, Basle, 1574, and oftener; ed. by *Simrock*, in a modern High-German transl., and with many wood-cuts, Berlin, 1872. Cf. *Ammon*, Gailer of Kaiserberg's Life, Writings, and Sermons, Erlang. 1826. See several Essays on Gailer in the **Hist. Polit. Papers*, 1861, 1862.

Finally, the German sermons of *Pelbart* (1500), a Franciscan, in spite of many and serious defects of method, were not devoid of that virtue that touches and moves the hearts of men.[2]

The so-called "*Plenaries*, according to the Ordinances of the Holy Christian Church," being German translations of the Gospels, Epistles, and Ordinary of the Mass, to which were added glossaries, homilies, and hymns, first published at Augsburg, in 1480; again at Strasburg, in 1483; at Basle, in 1522, and at many other places, contributed largely to the edification of the people, and, with some improvements, became excellent books of instruction and prayer.[3]

It is still a very common and erroneous belief, that every sort of *biblical* and *catechetical instruction* was wanting in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Of many modes of public religious instruction, one may be instanced by way of correcting this error—viz., *pictorial representations*, which had at this time obtained a very extensive circulation. Previously to the publication of *printed* Bibles, a small book, containing about fifty wood-cut prints, and erroneously ascribed to *St. Ansgar* († 865), was put into the hands of the people. It went under the name of "*The Poor Man's Bible*" (*Biblia Pauperum seu historia V. et N. T.*), because, as is obvious, the prints were gotten up with a view of enabling such as were too poor to purchase a manuscript copy of the Bible, to obtain, at a small cost, a tolerably full and accurate knowledge of its contents.

The pictures are very well executed, considering the age in which they appeared, and display a thorough acquaintance with the Sacred Text. Beside the prophecies and types of the Old Testament are placed the events indicating their fulfillment[1] in the New, to which are added biblical texts by way of illustration and explanation.[2]

---

[1] Sermon. quadragesim. Bresc. and other collections of his sermons, Venet. 1577, 2 T.

[2] Cf. *Ammon*, Hist. of Homiletics, Vol. I., p. 353 sq., and the beautiful sermon for Good Friday, epitomized by *Daniel*, l. c., p. 81–87.

[3] See Vol. III., § 313.

A "*Pictorial Edition of the Catechism*," on the plan of the Poor Man's Catechism, was edited by *Gefken*, in Hamburg, from the Heidelberg Codex 438. The subject is intelligently treated, and an introduction, giving the reader much valuable information concerning the modes of religious instruction in the fifteenth century, accompanies the work.[3]

§ 294. *Christian Art.*[4]

Vasari Giorgio (Painter and Architect at Florence, †1474). Le Vite de' più excellenti Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti. Publicate per cura di una Società di Amatori delle Arti Belle. Small 8vo, Florence, 1846–54. This is unquestionably the most useful of all the editions of this valuable work on the arts of Italy. The notes are copious, and the principal lives are followed by excellent commentaries. The editors have in this edition embodied not only the labors of all other Italian commentators, but also the researches of the German and some other foreign writers on art—Schorn, Rumohr, Gaye, Förster, and others. The editors are Carlo and Gaetano Milanesi, Carlo Pino, and Padre Vincenzo Marchese. Ed. by Vasari himself, in 3 vols., Florence, 1568. Milan ed. of 1800, in 7 vols. Engl. transl. of Vasari, in 5 vols., by Bohn; Germ. transl. by Schorn, Stuttgart, 1832 sq. *Lanzi*, L'Abate L., Storia Pittorica della Italia dal Risorgimento delle Belle Arti fin presso al fine del XVIII. Secolo, 4th ed., 6 vols. 8vo, Florence, 1822. The principal general work on Italian painting. *Lasinio*, *Cav. Carlo*, Pitture a Fresco del Campo Santo di Pisa, 42 plates f., Florence, 1812 and 1828. A magnificent work, and the most valuable illustration of the early wall-painting of Italy. *Marchese*, Padre L. V., Memorie dei più insigni Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti Domenicani, etc., 2 vols. 8vo, Florence, 1846; transl. into English by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, in 2 vols., Dublin, 1852.

---

[1] The same parallelism was also employed by *Overbeck*, in the marginal drawings to his cartoons of the seven Sacraments. (Tr.)

[2] In the now prevailing scarcity of ancient manuscripts and xylographic copies of such bibles, a new printed edition of the "*Biblia Pauperum*," at Vienna, 1863, and *Zurich*, 1867, with illustrations by *Laib* and *Schwarz*, was a very desirable acquisition. Cf. the Head Librarian, Dr. *Ruland's* Essay on Pictorial Representations as a vehicle of religious popular instruction (*Chilianeum*, Würzburg, 1862, Vol. I.)

[3] *Gefken* (preacher in Hamburg), The Pictorial Catechism of the fifteenth century, and the principal points of the Catechism during that time until Luther; the ten commandments, with twelve cuts. Lps. 1855, in 4to.

[4] Who can forget to call to mind here the beautiful poem of *Wm. von Schegel* on the alliance between Art and Religion, or the painting of *Overbeck*, representing the same subject? On the relation of art to religion, cf. *Staudenmaier*, The Genius of Christianity as manifested in Holy Lessons, Holy Practices, and Sacred Art, Mentz, 1843, Pt. I., p. 225–250, 3d ed. (Tr.)

Merrifield, Mrs., Original Treatises, dating from the twelfth to the eighteenth centuries, on the arts of Painting in Oil, Miniature, Mosaic, and on Glass, 2 vols. 8vo, London, 1849. *Eastlake*, Sir C. L., Materials for a History of Oil Painting, 8vo, London, 1847. *Lindsay*, Lord, Sketches on the Hist. of Christian art, 3 vols. 8vo, London, 1847. *Reynolds*, Sir J., The Discourses, etc., London, 1842. (Tr.) *Seroux d'Agincourt*, Histoire de l'art par les monuments, Par. et Strasb. 1823, 6 vols.; Germ., Berlin, 1840 sq.; Italian text, Mantua, 1841, 7 vols. f. Le moyen âge monumental et archéologique, avec un texte explicatif, exposant l'histoire de l'art d'après les monumens, Par. 1841. *A. F. Rio*, De l'art chrétien, ed. II., Par. 1865–1867, 4 vols. Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato da Erasmo *Pistolesi* con Disegni a contorni diretti dal Pittore *Camillo Guerra*. 8 magnificent vols. in fol., Rome, 1829–1838. (Tr.) Descrizione de Campidoglio di *Pietro Rhigetti*, 2 superb vols. fol., Rome, 1833–1836. (Tr.) *De Bastard*, Peinture et ornements des manuscrits, classés dans l'ordre chronologique pour servir à l'histoire des arts du dessin depuis le IVe siècle de l'ère chrétienne jusqu' à la fin du XVIe, Paris, 1840 sq. Cf. *l'Artiste*, No. 20, le Moyen âge monumental et archéologique, ou Vues des édifices les plus remarquables de cette époque en Europe, avec un text explicatif, exposant l'histoire de l'art d'après les monuments, Paris, 1841. Sir *Wm. Dugdale*, Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1655–1661–1673; a new and greatly enlarged ed. by Blandinel, Caley, and Ellis, 1817–1830, and 1846; Mrs. *Anna Jameson*, Memoirs of the early Italian painters, etc., 1845; Sacred and Legendary Art, 2 vols. 8vo, London, 1848. The Scriptural and Legendary History of Our Lord, etc., as represented in Christian Art, 1861. By the *same* authoress, Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts, 8vo, London, 1850, and Legends of the Madonna, etc., 8vo, London, 1852. (Tr.) *Laib* and *Schwarz*, Theory of the forms of the Romanesque and Gothic styles of Architecture, 2d ed., Stuttg. 1858. *Boisserée*, Monuments of Architecture on the banks of the Lower Rhine, from the seventh to the thirteenth century, Munich, (1833) 1842. The *same*, Hist. and description of the Cathedral of Cologne, Stutt. 1828. B.'s Monuments, etc., by Canon *F. Bock*, of Aix-la-Chapelle. *Puttrich*, Architectural Monuments of the M. A. in Saxony, Lps. 1836–1843. *Kugler*, Hand-book of the History of Art, Stuttg. (1842), 3d ed. 1859 (partially translated into English—viz., the Schools of Painting in Italy, by a Lady, and ed. by Sir *Charles Eastlake*, London, 1851), with atlas by *Guhl* and *Caspar*, Stuttg. 1845-54. **Schnaase*, Hist. of the arts of form, Düsseldorf, 1866 sq. Although not as complete in narration as is Kugler's, it yet gives a philosophical and hist. account of the origin of the various styles, and their connection with each other. **Lübke*, Outlines of a Hist. of Art, with illustrations, Stuttg. 1860. *Otte*, Hand-book of the Archaeology of Christian Art in Germany during the M. A., 3d ed., Lps. 1854. *Springer*, Hand-book of the Hist. of Art. †*Dursch*, Aesthetics of the Christian fine arts of the M. A. in Germany, Tübg. 1854. *Rumohr*, C. F. Von, Italian Researches, 3 vols. 8vo, Berlin and Stettin, 1827–31. Very critical. (Tr.) †*Neumaier*, Hist. of Christian Art, Schaffh. 1855, 2 vols. †*Jacob*, Art in the service of the Church, Landsh. 1857. Cf. also *Raumer*, The Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., p. 524–546. **Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 652–698.

The grand conceptions of Scholasticism and the practical tendency of Mysticism, as expressed by art, brought the idea of Christianity more fully home to man, and enabled him to penetrate more deeply into its real meaning and tremendous significance. Truth, stripped by intellectual process of the warmth and color of its surroundings, standing before the mind's eye in its native strength, destitute of the drapery that adds grace and beauty to the form and fills the imagination, shorn by logical methods of every attraction that appeals to sense, may indeed satisfy one of trained intellect, but has no fascination, no charm, and no subduing influence for a mind in which the life of the spirit is constantly in contact with that of the senses, and in which, to reach the former, the approaches must lie mainly through the latter. Such a soul will be loyal to Truth, will give her the devotion of his heart and the service of his senses when she comes to him, retaining indeed all her chaste and severe simplicity, but clad in the varying and graceful robes of art. Once mistress of his heart, she will be his inspiring genius and the guide of his life; for from the heart proceed, and to it return again, as to a center and source, every human force and agency, whether sensuous or spiritual; from that mysterious life-spring do all the energies, capabilities, and sympathies of man draw their vitality and power. The noble and graceful symbolism, borrowed partly from the works of nature and partly from history, employed by the Church to present dogmatic truths to the mental vision under living and tangible forms, left an impression on the mind that deepened and took definite shape as time went on, and exercised a fascination on the heart to which even the most obdurate were not insensible.

The Catholic Church, thus faithfully served by her handmaids Science and Art, could supply, with a never-failing versatility and fecundity, every want of human nature, and satisfy every aspiration of the intellect and all the complex demands of the imagination, the heart, and the senses.

This prolific power was never more manifest than in the age when *Neo-Germanic* architecture—which, since the time of *Vasari*, has been incorrectly called *Gothic*—replaced in the construction of churches the *Byzantine* and *Romanesque* styles hitherto in use. This style, which a modern writer has called *la pensée chrétienne bâtie*, or the architectural expression of Christian thought, spread with wonderful rapidity over France, Germany, England, Spain, and Sicily, but was never received in Italy, whose people, familiar with the style of Roman structures, did not care to admit another, which they believed to be a barbarous creation. Here *Brunelleschi* raised the dome over the cathedral of Florence (after 1431), and *Giotto* built its incomparable belfry; and here, too, *Julius II.* laid in 1506 the corner-stone of St. Peter's Basilica, designed by *Bramante.* The cathedral of Milan, conceived in the pure Gothic style by *Arrigo da Gamondia* (*Henry Arler of Gmünd*), but executed in the mixed Roman and Gothic style, marks the period of transition from one to the other, and presents the extremes of each. A similar blending of the two styles is also visible in the churches of Santa Maria del Popolo and St. Augustine, in Rome. The *pointed arch*, the characteristic of the Gothic style, is symbolical of Christian thought, aspiring heavenward,[1] fixed upon the life to come, carrying one's hopes beyond the grave, and on to the everlasting Jerusalem.[2] Again, the arch, in which the skill of the mason is made subservient to the stone-cutter's higher art, *branching out from the great masses of heavy stone* in which its bases are set, rises away into the *heights* above. The high towers, formerly intended to serve only the purpose of belfries, and standing apart from the main edifice, were afterward made to coalesce and harmonize with the general architecture, and, by a happy inspiration, became, as it were, the key and crowning glory of the vault. Their beauty and picturesqueness were much enhanced by the rich *pyramidal* shaped crowns of delicate *filigree-like* work, in which the dark and heavy stone was, in a manner, spiritualized, and grew into bright, transparent, and airy forms, as if to perpetually remind man that the more completely he puts off the things of earth, the more ethereal and spiritual will he become.[3]

---

[1] Coloss. iii. 1, 2.

[2] *Wiegemann*, On the Origin of the pointed arch, Düsseldorf, 1842. *Reichensperger*, The Chris. Germ. Architecture, Treves, 1845. *Didron*, Ann. arch. 1845.

[3] Whilst the architectures of Greece and Rome, says Card. *Wiseman*, like their religion, kept their main lines horizontal or parallel with the earth and care-

In its general arrangement, the Basilica, the temple of the living God, reposing upon the foundation of Prophets and Apostles, and sustained by Christ, its corner-stone,[1] presented the shape of a *cross*, the symbol and embodiment of all religion, and formed, between the nave and choir, a quadrangular space, commemorative of the *four Evangelists;* while its vault was borne up by *twelve columns*, suggestive of the *Twelve Apostles.* The thin walls, too weak to resist the thrust of the vault, were strengthened on the outside by buttresses, which, ornamented with carving and tracery, were sometimes bent into semi-circular arches, and branching out into all sorts of forms,[2] putting forth garlands and clusters of flowers in rich and varied profusion, forcibly reminded one in the fully developed *minster* or *dome*[3] of a petrified grove of oaks or the bewilder-

---

fully avoided breaking this direction, seeking rather its prolongation than any striking elevation, the Christian architecture threw up all its lines, so as to bear the eye to heaven; its tall, tapering and clustered pillars, while they even added apparent to real height, served as guides and conductors of the sense to the fretted roof, and prevented the recurrence of lines, which could keep its direction along the surface of the earth. Nothing could more strongly mark the contrast between the two religious systems. The minute details of its workmanship, the fretting and carving of its many ornaments, the subdivision of masses into smaller portions, all are in admirable accord with the mental discipline of the time, which subtilized and divided every matter of its inquiry into a cluster of ever-ramifying distinctions. The "dim religious light" that passed through the storied window, and gave a mysterious awe to the cavern-like recesses of the building, excellently became an age passionately fond of mystic lore, and the dimmest twilight of theological learning. Nothing could be more characteristic, nothing more expressive of the religious spirit which ruled those ages, than the architecture which in them arose.

But in Italy, and principally in Rome, it was otherwise. The type of art had been cast in those ages of triumph, and it was not rashly nor easily to be abandoned. She did not receive her art from Christianity, and therefore did not adopt the new and beautiful order. . . . The old basis of the Roman basilica was preserved. . . . But the dome! that truly Christian, sublime conception—that raising of a temple to the God of heaven, far above the earth—this grandest invention of modern architecture, who would have wished *that* to have been given up in St. Peter's, or any other Christian church? Card. *Wiseman* in his first lecture on *Holy Week*, delivered in Rome, 1837. (Tr.)

[1] Ephes. ii. 20; Apoc. xxi. 14.

[2] *Metzger*, Ornaments composed of German plants for the use of the plastic art and for painting, Munich, 1841, and the Cologne Cathedral Gazette of 1843 and 1844.

[3] "*Minster*," from monasterium, designates a *cloister*, or *major*—i. e. a *Cathe-*

ing view of a grotto filled with countless stalactites and stalagmites.

In Gothic ornamentation the vegetable kingdom played an important part, probably because of the symbolism of the *plant* struggling to free itself from the prison and shackles of earth and to rise toward heaven. The Germans, in whom the memories of the groves sacred to their forefathers[1] had not quite died out, promptly responsive to the influence of nature, unconsciously drew upon this source for their models of ornamentation. Still, the representation of animals frequently occurs and forms a not unimportant feature of the style. Thus beside the vine is the lion, fit emblem of faith; beside the rose stand the pelican and the turtle-dove, emblems of love and meekness; and beside the ivy reposes the dog, suggestive of faithful attachment. Besides these emblems of God's holy kingdom, there are terrible dragons and reptiles of enormous size—images of Satan vanquished—which serve, particularly the former, as supports, pedestals, and water-spouts, thus giving practical expression to the hint of St. Augustine: "*Maluit Deus ex malis facere bona, quam nulla mala esse in mundo.*" The very pavement of the temple, which represents the ocean, is alive with figures of dolphins and monsters of the deep.[2] From out the bosom of these mimic waters arise areas of dry land in the form of chapels, while the pillars with which they are studded represent islands, and above all stretches a vast expanse of vaulted ceiling, a faint image of the starry heavens. The three great divisions of sky, land, and water—history in its spiritual

---

dral Church; "*dome,*" from domus (dominica), indicates, in a general way, any house of God, but was soon restricted in its application to the bishop's Cathedral-church (ecclesia in *domo*, sc. episcopi, the church at the bishop's dome or palace); subsequently, often synonymous with *minster*. Some explain "*Dom*" as an abridgment of the inscription, customary in larger churches, D. O. M. = Deo Optimo Maximo, reading the three letters *together*, without the periods. Cf. *du Cange* Glossar., s. v. *domus.*

[1] See p. 19.

[2] On the floor of *St. Mark's*, in Venice, built in the Byzantine style, are represented in mosaic the virtues which were expected to preserve, and the vices which it was feared would ruin, the Republic. (Tr.)

sense—are here brought within narrow limits,[1] and over this rejuvenated world hovers the living spirit of Christ, alternately manifesting Himself through the Sacraments, in prayer and holy canticles.

The same depth of religious feeling, the same intelligent discrimination, is apparent in the arrangement of the numerous statues that crowd both the exterior and interior of the basilicas. High up above the doorway stand the princes of the Church, the founders and benefactors of the diocese, and even sovereigns, who regarded their office of defenders of Christendom as their highest privilege and most sacred duty, and who from their elevation have looked down, for ages, upon generation after generation entering the temple of salvation and peace. Under the very portico are martyrs and bishops and virgins, each the pride of some particular church, and all the glory of the Church Universal, recalling, as they do, the triumphs and fruits of grace now receiving their full maturity in Heaven. From the vault above, look down those whose voice proclaimed the saving Gospel throughout the world, and from north and south, east and west, gathered into one community of saints nations redeemed by the blood of Christ and destined to receive the mysterious deposit of His will, His promises, and His precepts. The *arched* vestibule or hall (Paradise) conducting to the entrance is generally adorned with comprehensive historical clusters representing the Creation, the Redemption, and the terrible scenes of the Resurrection and Last Judgment, that the faithful may be reminded to collect their thoughts before entering the House of God.[2] The *mystical rose* (wheel-window) above the door, emblematic of silence, has a kindred significance, because here all earthly clamor must be hushed.

Finally, the *stained-glass windows*, superseding the ancient storied tapestry, pour in a flood of mysterious light beneath the sublime and solemn vault;[3] for it is fitting that a more glorious light than that which is employed in the ordinary avocations of life, should illumine with a glow of heavenly splendor the sanctuary where mysteries the most stupendous and unfathomable are enacted. Here should enter the purest rays of the rising and the richest glories of the setting sun, softened and toned to shades of unearthly beauty by their play upon the gorgeously colored glass. Artists delighted in introducing into their historical scenes of God's kingdom, in heaven and on earth, the golden rays of morning and the richer and more mysterious hues of evening light. There was that about it that was not of earth—something that seemed a foretaste of Heaven, and which, when bathing in its glory the scenes of man's fall, of his resurrection and judgment, gave them an indescribable, awe-inspiring, and lasting effect. In whatever direction the devout worshiper turned his gaze he was everywhere met by representations calculated to keep him in a religious frame of mind, or, if a votary of pleasure, to excite in him pious thoughts and holy aspirations. Statues of saints adorning the tombs of princes and bishops rose in the semblance of life out of the clustered pillars. Statues, paintings, vestments, forms, and symbols spoke to the eye—were veritable books for the learned and illiterate alike, where each might learn his duties to God and his relations to the world to come,[1] and did for all classes what printing did more comprehensively at a later day.

---

[1] Ps. cxlviii. and Cant. Dan., c. 3.

[2] Professor Dr. *Cornel. Bock*, The cycle of imagery in the vestibule of the minster of Freiburg, Ibid. 1862.

[3] *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 673 sq. *Gessert*, Hist. of Glass-staining in Germany and the Netherlands, France, England, Italy, and Spain, Stuttg. 1839.

Monasteries were the schools of architects and sculptors, and their children led the way in the construction of grand and imposing basilicas. Fulda and St. Gall were famous for their exertions in this field, and the *Dominican convents* were the congenial homes of Gothic art. As time went on, laymen skilled in the science of building and the mason's art formed themselves into corporations and guilds (brotherhoods of masons and others), for the purpose of preserving and perpetuating their scientific knowledge and the secrets of their craft, and to mutually aid each other in erecting those gigantic structures which have been the wonder and admiration of every age since. Until the twelfth century, churches were everywhere, except in Italy, Spain, and Languedoc, generally constructed of wood, but in the succeeding century an active rivalry sprang up all over Europe—countries, provinces, and cities vying with the other in erecting new temples, marvelous cathedrals, domes, spires, and monuments, such as, in our own age, the most powerful States, backed by their immense wealth of financial resource,[1] could not think of attempting, but which, stimulated by the inspirations of faith, impelled by a generous devotion, and strengthened by cooperative union, single cities and single convents then courageously undertook and triumphantly completed. Faith, and faith alone, could set whole populations in motion and nerve them to great enterprises.

---

[1] *Gregory the Great* (Epist., lib. VII., ep. 109) says: "Pictures are the books of those who can not read; they are not adored, but people see there that which is to be adored." In the magnificent poem, "*Titurel*," the idea of Christian architecture is admirably set forth. Cf. *Boisserée*, Essay on the description of the temple of St. Graal, in the third song of Titurel, Munich, 1835.

The imposing solemnity of the religious ceremonial which accompanies the placing of a corner-stone or the dedication of a church[2] is an evidence of its potency and an instance in point. A noble religious ardor, a glowing enthusiasm for the advancement of Christian architecture, pervaded Europe from end to end, and set all hands to work. Even in the far North, Archbishop Eystein built at *Drontheim*[3] a cathedral which is the most solid, the most imposing, the most finished monument of the Scandinavian peninsula. In *Germany*, the church which ranks next after those of Our Lady at Treves (commenced 1227, completed 1283), and St. Elizabeth at Marburg (commenced 1255, completed 1283), as a master-piece of Gothic art, is the cathedral of *Cologne*, that model church[4]

---

[1] *Prisac*, Construction of churches during the Middle Ages (Cologne Cathedral Gazette, year 1842, nros. 25 and 26). *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. 32.

[2] For detailed descriptions, see *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 662 sq. and 697 sq.

[3] *Minutoli*, The cathedral of Drontheim, and the Christian Architecture of the Scandinavian Normans, during the Middle Ages, Berlin, 1853.

[4] After the plans of master Gerhard; the cathedral of Strasburg after those of Erwin de Steinbach. Cf. †*Fred. Beck*, Hist. of a German stone-mason, Munich, 1834. *Theodor Melas*, Erwin of Steinbach, Hamburg, 1834, 3 pts. *Boisserée*, Hist. and description of the cathedral of Cologne, Stuttg. 1828. *J. Görres*, The cathedral of Cologne and the minster of Strasburg, Ratisb. 1842.

(commenced 1248, work suspended 1308, resumed 1824), which, together with those of *Strasburg* and *Freiburg*, forms the majestic Gothic trilogy of the Rhine. The more ancient basilicas of Mentz, Spire, and Worms are venerable specimens of Byzantine style.

Among the splendid examples of Gothic architecture in *France* are the cathedrals of Chartres,[1] dedicated in 1260, after it had been one hundred and fifty years in building; of Rheims (1232), the metropolitan church of the kingdom; of Amiens (1228); of Beauvais (1250); Sainte Chapelle, built by St. Louis (1245–1248); the church of St. Denys, the burial-place of the French kings, and the towers of Notre Dame, commenced in 1163, and completed in 1223.

Of the churches in *Belgium*, the most remarkable is that of (St. Michael and) St. Gudule, in Brussels (1226), and that of Dunes, built by four hundred monks (1214–1262).

Among the best specimens of Gothic in *England* are the cathedral of Salisbury, the most beautiful in the kingdom (1220); one-half of that of York (1227–1260); the choir of Ely (1235); the nave of Durham (1212), and the national Abbey of Westminster (1247); and in *Spain*, the metropolitan churches of Burgos and Toledo, commenced by St. Ferdinand in 1228.[2]

The other arts, faithful handmaids and generous rivals, soon commenced to gather about Christian architecture, their elder sister and mistress. *Sculpture* led the way, and, after many feeble attempts, reached, as early as the *thirteenth* century, a marvelous degree of excellence. Then did those graceful forms of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the Angels, and Saints, that adorn the interior and exterior of basilicas, start from the shapeless blocks of marble in semblance of life; then, too, were produced those figures of high and mighty lords and their chaste spouses, sleeping the sleep of the just on their marble couches, their hands folded, and their heads reclining on the knees of angels; or, again, having their numerous family of children gathered about them.

---

[1] This cathedral was built after the plans of Robert de Coucy.

[2] "Gothic architecture," says *Kraus* (Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 415), "maintained its ascendency until the middle of the fourteenth century, when it declined, and decoration, outstepping its proper limits, ceased to be subservient to construction. This style of architecture then lost its essential organic character.

"It was characteristic of *later Gothic* to give an undue prominence to technical details, which were the result of making the construction of the vault independent of the substructure. During the thirteenth century, the vault still retained its cruciform shape, but it was shortly after broken up into a number of vaults, resembling a *network* (*starry* vaults), thus destroying the function of the pillars, which, instead of supporting the vault, were subdivided into parts, whence arose plinths and ribs, serving no perceptible purpose. . . .

"Nevertheless, many of the larger churches, like the cathedral of *Prague;* the church of Our Lady, at Antwerp; of St. Barbara, at Kuttenberg, and the more modern portions of the cathedrals of *Vienna*, *Antwerp*, and *Strasburg*, exhibit architectural excellences of no inconsiderable merit, notably in the construction of spires." (Tr.)

The most beautiful specimens of Gothic sculpture preserved in the cathedrals of Germany, particularly in those of Strasburg and Freiburg; and of France, particularly in those of Notre Dame de Paris, Amiens, and Rouen, both in the reliefs of portals and in detached statues, belong to the interval between 1300 and 1450. The figures of this age disclose an active and highly excited inner life. This is evident from the rising, aspiring attitudes, from the violent bendings and contortions of the body, from the peculiar carriage of the head, and from the broken folds of the cumbersome and heavy drapery. Variety of conception, depth of feeling, and warmth of fervor, are nowhere more visible than in the numerous statues of the Blessed Virgin.

Sculpture was entirely in the hands of seculars. The plastic art was now employed not alone in adorning churches, but also in ornamenting structures destined for profane purposes—such as court-houses, guild-halls, baronial castles, and private dwellings. Still, art did not cease to be mainly devoted to the service of the Church and to the interpretation of Christian ideas; and even those fantastic and ludicrous representations, to be found carved on the arm-rests ("*misericordias*") of many cathedral stalls, are not intended to convey any idea of disrespect to the clergy or to holy things, but simply to show to what the abuse of holy things will lead.

Besides the works in *stone*, we should not omit to mention that many creditable *brass castings* (tombs) and *carvings in wood* (stalls, choirs, and pulpits), and *ivory*, were produced. The plastic art flourished most in *Germany* and *Italy*. *Italian* *art*, though unable to entirely escape Gothic influences, took a very different direction from that of Germany. Even in the thirteenth century, the growing influence of ancient art was perceptible in the works of *Niccolò Pisano;* and from this time forth it became more pronounced, disclosing its presence in the tendency to study living forms and in an assertion of individuality. This is evident in the great works of *Giovanni Pisano* (from 1290), in the duomo of Orvieto; in those of *Giotto* (born 1276, died 1336), in the duomo and *campanile*, or bell-tower, of Florence; in three celebrated bronze doors (1339–1340) of *Andrea Pisano*, and in the two bronze doors of *Ghiberti*, which form the chief ornament of the baptistery of *San Giovanni*, and which Michael Angelo declared were not unworthy of being the gates of Paradise.[1]

Luca della Robbia, a pupil of Ghiberti's, molded bassi relievi in terra cotta, which he colored and covered with a durable enamel. His most famous work is the Choir-boys' Practice, in the cathedral of Florence, in which the attitudes are so natural and the expression so life-like that one is astonished he does not hear the music of their voices. The works of *Donatello*, who is credited with being the restorer of the plastic art in Italy, are destitute of depth of thought and feeling, and, to supply the place of these, he has given to his figures a strained energy of movement. The tomb of St. Sebald, by *Vischer* († 1530), is the most precious art-treasure in the church of Nürnberg. The grand *tomb of Maximilian*, in the Franciscan church at Innsbruck, is the work of one of Vischer's pupils.

Painting, in its turn, became the ally of architecture and sculpture, and lent its aid to the work of glorifying God. Taking at once a bold and rapid flight, it produced those master-pieces[2] which are the pride of Italy, and which have never since been equaled. *Pisa* and *Siena* were the cradle, and *Florence* the fostering mother of this art. The first Italian school worthy of the name, and inspired by the true spirit of religious art, consisted of an association of artists under the patronage of St. Luke, and directed by *Guido of Siena* (1221) and *Giunta of Pisa* (1210). It reached a high degree of perfection in *Cimabué* (1240–1303), whose painting of the Annunciation was triumphantly received by the Florentines. All the paintings of this school have a gold ground, are pious and majestic in expression, but the figures are somtimes defective in drawing, portions being immoderately elongated.

---

[1] Cf. *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., pp. 415, 416. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., p. 539–546; *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 674–679.

Giotto (1276–1337), who was still truer to nature, more successful in delineating its graceful forms and dramatic attitudes, added fresh lustre to his own school, and was the real founder of that of Florence. The same religious ardor, the same sublime enthusiasm, that prompted the noble deeds of St. Francis of Assisi and inspired the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, warmed the heart and spiritualized the thoughts of this artist. His most illustrious pupils were *Taddeo Gaddi*, who completed the Campanile of Florence after his master's design; *Giovanni da Milano; Giottino; Buffalmaco* (1351), who completed the frescoes in the *Campo Santo* (grave-yard) of Pisa; *Orcagna* (c. 1350–1360), whose greatest work, the Last Judgment, is powerful in conception and in the execution of individual figures, but lacking in unity of composition and dramatic power.

Contemporaneously with the school of Giotto were the younger Sienese school, of which the two brothers *Lorenzetti* (1342) were the chief ornaments, and the local schools of Naples, Ancona, Bologna, Milan, Verona, and Venice. A rapid and very marked progress is perceptible in the works of the fifteenth century, the *antico moderno* or *quattrocento* age of art. Foremost among the leaders of this age was Domenico *Ghirlandajo*, who gave greater prominence than any of his predecessors to physical form, making it nearly, if not quite, coordinate with spiritual expression.

Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole (B. 1387, † 1455), more conservative in his methods than Ghirlandajo, was one of the most celebrated of the early Florentine painters. He is the best representative of religious painters, and is unsurpassed in the mild, spiritual, and heavenly expression and the beauty of form which are characteristic of all his paintings. A man most sincerely and thoroughly pious, and gifted with a mysterious poetry which pervaded his whole nature, he never commenced painting until after he had first commended himself to God in prayer, and frequently shed tears while engaged at his work. When offered the archbishopric of Florence by Pope Nicholas V., he referred him to *Fra Antonino* as more worthy the honor, and expressed himself content with his little cell, where he painted those wonderful pictures breathing so "heavenly a sweetness."[1]

Masaccio (B. 1402, † 1443) studied nature perhaps more closely than any of his predecessors, and gave special prominence to its *objective* side, thus breaking through the traditionary tendency to take a *subjective* view of everything, and taking the lead in the path to true excellence. "He appears," says Sir Joshua Reynolds (Disc. XII.), "to be the first who discovered the path that leads to every excellence to which the art afterward arrived, and may therefore be justly considered as one of the great fathers of modern art."

Leonardo da Vinci (B. 1452, † 1519), a man of versatile talents, excelling in sculpture, architecture, painting, music, engineering, and mechanics generally, mathematics, astronomy, botany, and anatomy, in his great painting of the *Last Supper*, in the refectory of the Dominican convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Milan, has solved the problem of all art—the elevation of the natural by the infusion of the spiritual.[2]

Fra Bartolomeo (B. 1469, † 1517) rivaled in prominent relief, handling of light and shade, and delicacy of execution, even Leonardo himself, whose works he studied; and in grouping, composition, and grandeur of conception, some of his paintings are not inferior to those of Raphael. His figures are simple, dignified, and graceful, and the folds of his drapery easy, natural, and striking.

---

[1] The Life of *Fra Giovanni da Fiesole*, O.S.D., according to *Giorgio Vasari*, from the Italian (in Germ.), by Louis Schorn, 1840. *Förster*, The Life and Works of Fiesole, Ratisbon, 1859.

[2] *Rio*, Leonard de Vinci et son école, Paris, 1855; see *Hist. Polit. Papers* of the year 1857, Vol. 39, p. 759–776; *Hefele*, The Last Supper, by Leon. da Vinci (Tübg. Quart. 1867, nro. 1).

Michael Angelo Buonarotti (B. 1475, † 1564),[1] that universal genius, equally eminent in architecture, sculpture, and painting, and possessing considerable merit as a poet and musician, completely revolutionized art. His style is characterized by sublimity of conception, nobility of form, and ease and breadth of manner. He was evidently quite familiar with the works of *Luca Signorelli*, whose general style he followed closely. There are faults of manner in his figures, which are sometimes too elaborate, and give too much prominence to the display of *muscular* strength and movement—defects from which even his women and children are not wholly exempt. This extraordinary man, the sculptor of *Moses*, in the Church of S. Pietro in Vincoli, a work in which all the terror of Old Law is vividly expressed; the designer of the *Cartoon of Pisa*, which displays every variety of attitude and action, great anatomical knowledge and admirable skill in foreshortening; the painter of the *Last Judgment* on the altar-wall of the Sistine Chapel, which is unique in the history of art; of the *Creation of the World*, and of *Man*, the *Fall of Man*, and his *Redemption*, on the ceiling of the same chapel, devoted the last days of his restless life, without price or remuneration, to the building of St. Peter's in Rome, of which the four great pillars, the drum, and the double cupola are his work.

Among the most distinguished representatives of the mystic School of Umbria were *Perugino* (1447–1525), *Francesco Francia* (1450–1518), and, preëminent above all, *Raphael of Urbino* (1483–1520).[2] The works of Perugino are especially remarkable for purity of sentiment, which lends them an inexpressible charm; but he adhered, to the last, to the formal conventionalities of the *quattrocento* (fifteenth century) style of art.

A striking similarity exists between the early works of *Francia* and those of Perugino. They exhibit the same depth of feeling and purity of sentiment, but are less conventional, less ideal, and more true to nature.

The works of *Raphael*, which are quite numerous, display the characteristics of *three distinct styles*, the first of which is the *Perugino*, the second the *Florentine*, and the third the *Roman*, each having its own merits and indicating the progress of art. In the first, he follows the traditionary school of his master; in the second (fr. 1504), he is eclectic; in the third, first exemplified in his *Heliodorus* (1512), he exhibits the results of his own study, experience, skill, and genius; forms an original style, distinctly and peculiarly his own, in which all his better qualities are combined in proper coordination to each other; body and soul, sentiment and passion, the sensuous and the spiritual, receive each its just degree of prominence; and which, while meriting unqualified approbation, won for him the proud title of *Prince of Artists.* His frescoes in the Vatican Chambers (*Stanze*) are unrivaled among the works of modern painting, though his numerous *charming Madonnas* have perhaps contributed more than all his other productions put together, to his great popularity. His one great aim, in all these works, was to give glory to the Church and to perpetuate the names of Popes Julius II. and Leo X., under whose patronage they were undertaken and executed. His Theology or *Dispute* on the Blessed Sacrament, and his Philosophy or School of Athens, in the Vatican, are both wonderful compositions of a different character—the former being distinguished by vastness of conception, symmetrical figures, and a display of magnificent heads, and the latter by its greater freedom and fullness of form. The Theology, according to *Mr. Ruskin*, is the fullest expression of the Christian idea, and the Philosophy indicates its decline. This incomparable painter, whom the Italians call *Il Divino*, died when precisely thirty-seven years of age, in the full tide of life and vigor of intellectual power; but, had he lived longer, he could scarcely have surpassed the Heliodorus, the Madonna di San Sisto, and the cartoons at Hampton Court. He was born at Urbino, April 6, 1483, and died at Rome, April 6, 1520.

---

[1] *Condivi, Asc.*, Vita di Michelangiolo Buonarruoti, 4to, Rome, 1553. Ed. *A. F. Gori*, Florence, 1746.

[2] *J. D. Passavant*, Raphael of Urbino, and his father. Giovanni Sanzio, Lps. 1839, in two parts, and with fourteen engravings.

While the Umbrian School were embodying the Christian idea in living and breathing forms of unsurpassable excellence, the *Lombard School* were scarcely less assiduously reviving the glories of *ancient art*, which was not without its influence on Raphael, as is evident from his arabesques in the gallery or loggie of the Vatican. Among the chief ornaments of this school were *Giacomo Squarcione* (1394–1474) and *Andrea Mantegna* (1430–1506); and its tendency was to give greater importance to the development of physical beauty and less to religious feelings and the influence of grace, which gave so much charm and fascination to the works of the older schools.

This tendency was still further carried out by *Correggio* (1494–1534) and *Titian* (1477–1576), respectively the founders of the Schools of Parma and Venice. Correggio displayed a wonderful power in producing the most delicate effects of light and shade (*chiaro-oscuro*), and an unapproachable skill in foreshortening. His faces are extremely beautiful, expressive, and full of life; his tints are rich and warm, and exquisitely delicate; his contours easy and graceful, and his draperies natural, and flowing in pleasing lines. But his style did much toward developing the sensuous element in art. Titian, apart from technical qualities, his glowing color and solid impasto, gives an attractive and dignified representation of the human form; but his is the beauty of fine material development and physical perfection, borrowing nothing from religious thought or devotional feeling. Eminent as an historical, landscape, and portrait painter, he was unrivaled in the last-named department of art. The pictures which give the best idea of his manner in the various periods of his life, are the *Christ of the Tribute-money*, the *Entombment*, and the *Death of Peter Martyr*.

Giovanni Bellini (1426–1516), Caposcuola or Founder of the *quattrocentro* School of Venice, besides reaching in coloring, for which this school was preëminent, an admirable truth of nature and an ethereal, glowing transparency, he was the only one of all the painters of this age who, from the beginning of his career to the end of it, scrupulously adhered to his individual style, and never displayed material beauty at the cost of devotional feeling.[1]

---

[1] The details concerning Italian painters have been taken chiefly from the "Biographical Catalogue of the principal Italian painters," "by a Lady," ed. by *Ralph N. Wornum*, London, 1855. (Tr.)

In *Germany*, side by side with the Brotherhood of Stonemasons, schools of painting were founded—first at *Cologne*, on the banks of the Rhine; next at Nürnberg, in *Franconia*, and, still later on, in *Suabia*. *William* (c. 1380) and *Stephen* (c. 1440) were the first two masters of the Cologne school, and the latter is the painter of the celebrated "Cathedral Picture," *Dombild*, representing the Three Wise Men, St. Gereon, and St. Ursula and her companions.

The Flemish School owed its origin to *Christopher* (1471–1501); but in a more special sense to the two brothers *Hubert* and *John van Eyk* (1366–1470), the latter of whom invented *oil-painting*, thereby realizing greater brilliancy and warmth of coloring.[1] The greatest representative of this school was *Hans Hemling.*

The best representative of the Franconian School after the time of *Michael Wohlgemuth*, was the genial and prolific *Albert Dürer* (1471–1528), who, notwithstanding his pronounced sympathy for the Reformation, steadily adhered to the *traditionary ecclesiastical style* of art.

The *Suabian* School, which opened with *Martin Schoen* of Augsburg († 1499), developed more and more its distinctively Christian character in the works of *Bartholomew Zeitblom* of Ulm († 1517), and in those of *Frederic Herlen* († 1491) and *Martin Schaffner* (1508–1539); but, above all, in the paintings of the two *Holbeins*, first of Augsburg and afterward of Basle (1450–1554).

Finally, *Music*,[2] sister to sculpture, painting, and poetry, harmonizing thought, and swelling in sweet and inspiring melody through the old cathedral vaults, added her tribute to theirs, thus consummating and crowning the civilizing mission of the arts. After the introduction of the *organ*, sacred compositions rapidly appeared, which the Church, far from viewing with suspicion, hailed with grateful recognition, thus giving to the art of music the ecclesiastical sanction and recognition which she had cheerfully accorded to her sister arts. The deficiency in musical signs and measure, or time, were, to a great extent, obviated by the pious monk, *Guido of Arezzo* (P. 1024), who, taking advantage of the interstices between the lines, invented the diatonic scale, called the gamut. This was still further perfected in the eleventh century by *Franco*, a master of Paris, who indicated the duration of notes by diversity of form.[1] The Order of Cîteaux gave special attention to the study of church-song. The Popes, fearing that the austere dignity of the plain chant might suffer by too frequent use of figured music,[2] restricted its employment to the higher festivals.

---

[1] *Wagen*, Hub. and Jno. von Eyk, Bresl. 1822. *Schopenhauer*, John van Eyk and his Followers.

[2] Cf. *Raumer*, l. cit., lib. VI., p. 519–523; *Hurter*, l. c., Vol. IV., pp. 651, 652; †Card. *Wiseman*, Four Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies of *Holy Week*, deliv. in Rome, 1837.

§ 295. *Penitential Discipline.* Cf. Bibliography, Vol. I., p. 424.

Bp. *Fessler*, Excommunication and its consequences, 2d ed., Vienna, 1860.

The decay of spiritual life is inevitably followed by a relaxation of penitential discipline. The abuse consequent upon granting indulgences to crusaders, to those contributing to the *building of St. Peter's Church*, in Rome, and to others in commutation for similar works, modified the rigors, and eventually wrought the complete destruction of the whole penitentiary system. To the earnest zeal of the early Christian ages succeeded an incorrigible levity. The insolent sarcasm of sectaries, which grew daily more violent and offensive, tended to cool the ardor for penitential practices; and they were largely aided in their work by the lethargy and remissness of many of the clergy, who, instead of instructing the faithful, strengthening the weak, and encouraging all in works of penance, wholly neglected their priestly duties. It would seem that the only arms available to bishops for the government of those committed to them were *excommunication and interdict*, and of these they made so frequent and inconsiderate a use that councils felt called upon to enact laws restricting the application of these canonical punishments.[1]

---

[1] This Franco, according to others, hailed from Cologne, and was a contemporary of Frederic I. (the statement given above is according to *Hurter* and *Stenzel*); his *Ars cantûs mensurabilis* was published by *Gerbert*, De cantu et musica sacra, III., 1 sq.

[2] Cf. the remarkable Decretal of John XXII.: "Docta sanctorum Patrum," Extravagant. Comm., lib. III., Tit. I., cap. unic. It opens with a high commendation of music generally, after which the Pope reprobates the lascivious melodies of those singers, who offended against clerical modesty, by accompanying with bodily gestures the sense expressed by their words. Those so offending, whether exempt or not from episcopal jurisdiction, were suspended from clerical duties for eight days.

There exists an analogy between the spiritual and physical life of man; and, as if to prove the presence and activity of this law, those unhealthy and deadly phenomena in the religious and moral order were accompanied, at intervals, by others equally extraordinary and fatal in the physical, such as pestilences and the *Black Plague*.[2] These frightful scourges led to a revival of penitential severity, which, in some places, was carried to the extreme of self-flagellation. Large troops of *Flagellants*[3] went about scourging themselves, one of which was headed by *St. Vincent Ferrer*, and it required the powerful influence of Gerson, at the Council of Constance, to dissuade him from so unseemly an extravagance.[4] These enthusiasts, seeing in the disasters of the times evident tokens of God's anger, hoped to avert it by their macerations, thus trusting more in their own works than in the efficacy of Christ's merits and the instrumentality of His Sacraments. Their self-sufficiency and presumption carried them to such a length that they finally rejected, with contemptuous disdain, whatever came from the Church,[5] and hence the University of Paris characterized a branch of them as "*secta contra Deum, contra famam et contra salutem ipsorum.*"

---

[1] See p. 796.

[2] *Hecker*, The Black Plague in the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1832. *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 91 sq.

[3] *Boileau*, Historia flagellantium seu de recto et perverso flagellorum usu apud Christianos, Paris, 1700. *Foerstemann*, Hist. of the Fraternities of Flagellants, Halle, 1828. *Mohnike*, same subject, in *Illgens*' Hist. Review, 1833, Vol. III. *Schneegans*, The Flagellants, and especially the great Procession of Strasburg, in 1349, according to Francis of *Tischendorf*, Lps. 1840. This work contains new statements. Cf. p. 599, and *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXXIII., p. 446–457.

[4] *Gerson*, Ep. missa magistro Vincent., etc. (Opp., T. II., p. 658; *von der Hardt*, T. III., Pt. VII., p. 94 sq.)

[5] Cf. *Raynald.*, ad an. 1372, nro. 33. *Freiburg* Cyclop., Vol. IV., p. 367–370; French transl., Vol. 8, p. 533–536.

Gerson, notwithstanding that he combated them, because, as he said, "error, contempt of the priesthood, rejection of confession and the sacraments, extortion, robbery, and all manner of vices marked their presence," deprecated the employment of violent measures for their suppression.

Still more extraordinary was the appearance, about the same time, of a sect whose practices were as wide apart as the poles from those of the Flagellants. They were known as the *Dancers*, from a wild and violent dance (St. Guy's or St. John's Dance) which formed the main feature of their exercises.[1] Some derived its origin from King David (II. Sam. vi. 14; Coll. I. Chron. xv. 29), and others believed them possessed by the devil. The latter opinion seems to have been the more generally accepted, for the ecclesiastical forms of exorcism were employed to free them from the possession of the evil spirit. They were eventually pursued by the Inquisition as rigorously as even the Flagellants themselves.

§ 296. *Propagation of Christianity and Conversion of the Jews.*

In spite of the general decline just referred to, there were not wanting, particularly among the missions established in pagan lands, evidences of active faith and generous devotion. Thus it was not so much lack of energy and zeal on the part of the missionaries, as the stubborn resistance of those for whose weal they spent themselves, that retarded the conversion of the *Lithuanians* of *Europe*.[2] The exertions of the *Teutonic Knights* to propagate the Gospel in the countries bordering on Lithuania cost them dear. Eight of their number were seized and burnt together, in 1260.

After a time, however, individual Lithuanians entered the *Russian* Church.

---

[1] Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclop., Vol. XII., art. "*Tänzer*" = Dancers; French transl., Vol. 6, and *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, art. "Flagellants;" also, *Hecker*, The Mania for Dancing, an epidemic disease in the M. A., Berlin, 1832.

[2] *Kojalowicz*, Hist. Lithuaniae, Pars I., Dantisci, 1659; Pt. II., Antv. 1663, 4to. Cf. *Narbut*, Bibliography heading, § 180, p. 235.

A still more important step toward their conversion was taken by the Grand Duke *Jagello*, who, desirous to receive the hand of the princess *Hedwig*, and with it the crown of Poland, embraced Christianity himself, and obliged his subjects to follow his example (1386).[1] After receiving baptism at Cracow, and being proclaimed king of Poland under the name of *Wladislaus III.*, he entered Lithuania, attended by a splendid retinue, caused the national pagan sanctuaries to be demolished, thus proving, to the satisfaction of his subjects, the impotency of the presiding deities; after which, assuming the office of catechist, he instructed his own vassals in the Christian religion, stood godfather for them at their baptism, and, as such, presented each with a new suit of clothes. Others, attracted by his generosity, came in troops, and so great was their number, that, it being no longer possible to baptize them individually, they were divided into groups, each of which was sprinkled with holy water, and received some common name—as Peter, Paul, and the like. Nobles and military chiefs alone were baptized singly.

Andrew Vasillo, a Polish Franciscan, and confessor to the queen, was appointed bishop of *Wilna*. The appointment was confirmed by Pope *Urban VI.*, who placed the new bishop under his own immediate jurisdiction, and forbade the intermarriage of Greek and Roman Christians.

It is evident from the manner in which these people received baptism, that, in their case, the sacrament was no more than an outward ceremony, conveying to their minds no definite meaning or impression, and unaccompanied by any real sentiment of interior conversion; and hence, we are not surprised to learn that Paganism long retained its hold on their minds.

Aeneas Sylvius relates, on the testimony of the monk Jerome of Prague, that shortly before the Council of Basle, the Lithuanians were so attached to their idols that they resisted, even to the point of rebellion, the efforts of Jerome to overturn their pagan altars, notwithstanding that he acted on the combined authority of King Wladislaus and Duke Witoudt.[1]

---

[1] *Dlugossi*, Hist. Polon. ed. Francof. 1711 f., lib. X., p. 96 sq. According to this author, Jagello was baptized with his brother, Switrigal, and his cousin, Witoudt. On this event, cf. *Dlugloss*, l. c., p. 109, and the annals of *Jno. Lindenblatt*, a contemporary author, published by *Voigt*, Koenigsberg, 1823, p. 60 sq., 334 sq.

The history of the conversion of the *Laplanders* is very similar to that of the Lithuanians,[2] they being, since 1279, subject to Sweden, and was mainly accomplished by *Hemming*, Archbishop *of Upsala*, who consecrated a church for them at Tornea in 1335.

The Jews gave small comfort to the Church during this epoch. In the Middle Ages, the legend of the *Wandering Jew* tended to strengthen the conviction that they were a deicidal race and accursed of God. Now, as during the migration of nations, always clever speculators, they gradually accumulated, partly by commercial enterprise and partly by usurious exactions, colossal fortunes in Italy, France, and Germany. It being the generally received opinion among Christians that to loan money on interest was usury, and, as such, unlawful, all financial transactions of this character passed into the hands of the Jews, who, though "*forbidden to take interest from their co-religionists, were permitted to exact it from others*,"[3] and in this way amassed extraordinary sums. Some idea may be had of their opportunities when it is stated that the emperor Louis of Bavaria forbade them to take a higher rate of interest than *forty* per cent. This immense wealth was frequently the cause of ferocious persecutions against them, and to account to the public, in some way, for so infamous a proceeding, they were accused of being at the bottom of all public calamities, of causing pestilence and earthquakes, and were charged with being guilty of vices the most infamous and of committing crimes the most horrid, among which were poisoning wells, murdering Christian children and drinking the blood at their paschal feasts, bewitching the atmosphere, and others equally absurd, if less atrocious.

---

[1] *Aeneas Sylvius*, De statu Europ. sub Frider. III., c. 20. (*Freheri* Rerum Germ. scriptor., ed. *Struve*, T. II., p. 114.)

[2] *J. Schefferi* Lapponia, Frcf. 1673, 4to.

[3] Deut. xxv.: "Non foeneraberis fratri tuo ad usuram, pecuniam, fruges, nec quamlibet aliam rem, sed alieno." Deut. xxviii.: "Foeneraberis gentibus multis, et ipse a nullo foenus accipies." (Tr.)

In this way was popular fury roused against them. Their condition in Germany was, at best, precarious, but it was incomparably worse in France and England.

The Popes, who are at all times and everywhere the protectors of the weak and the advocates of the oppressed, lifted up their voice in favor of the unfortunate Jews, exhorting Christians to justice and mercy, holding menaces over the refractory, and severely reproving such as wished to forcibly compel them to receive baptism. "Let no Jew," said *Innocent III.*, "be constrained to receive baptism, and he that will not consent to be baptized, let him not be molested. Let no one unjustly seize their property, disturb their feasts, or lay waste their cemeteries."

These instructions were repeated by many other Popes, and among them Gregory IX. and Innocent IV.[1]

On the other hand, attempts of a different character, and more direct, were made to reclaim the Jews from error, and lead them back to truth, by enlightening their minds. Works were written with the special aim of refuting their objections against Christianity, by learned and pious schoolmen, among whom were Alanus of Ryssel, St. Thomas Aquinas, and *Raymond Martini* of Barcelona († P. A. D. 1286), whose polemico-apologetical work, entitled "*Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*,"[2] is the most remarkable treatise of the kind written during the Middle Ages. The conversion, in the twelfth century, of the celebrated Jew *Hermann*, who became a Premonstratensian religious, was the result, not of clever controversy, but of Christian *zeal and charity*,[3] and was followed by happy consequences.

In Spain, unhappily, they enjoyed but scant toleration. Ferdinand and Isabella (1492) gave them their choice between baptism and exile. They had drawn upon themselves the popular indignation by their usury, and their connection with the Moors, now confined within a very limited territory, had, and not without reason, rendered them objects of suspicion to the civil authority. In 1492, one hundred and sixty thousand Jewish families quitted Spain, and found an asylum in Portugal. But here their condition was not much improved. In 1496, they were again obliged to make choice between baptism and exile, and the same alternative was offered to the Moors.

---

[1] In *Raynaldus*, ad an. 1235, nro. 20. *Graesse*, The Tannhaeuser and the Wandering Jew, Dresden, 1844, 2d ed. 1861; *Depping*, The Jews of the Middle Ages, Stuttg. 1834, and especially, *Jost*, Hist. of the Israelites down to our own days, Berlin, 1825 sq., Pt. IV. sq. *Wiener*, Regesta of the Hist. of the Jews during the M. A., Hanov. 1862, 2 vols.

[2] Ed. *Carpzovius*, Lps. 1687 fol.

[3] *Weber*, Hermann the Premonstratensian, or the Jews in the M. A., Nördlingen, 1861 (treated as an historical novel).

The Mussulman domination in Spain came to an end by the capture of *Granada*, their last stronghold, in 1492, after it had lasted eight hundred years. Immediately after the conquest of this city, the Moors were allowed the free exercise of their religion; but, owing to the discovery of a conspiracy in 1498, they, like the Jews, were forced either to accept baptism or go into exile, and the conditions of the alternative were executed with merciless severity in 1501.

The discovery of America, and the circumnavigation of Africa by Vasco de Gama, suggested the idea, which was ardently embraced, of proclaiming the Gospel to all nations, even to the uttermost bounds of the earth. Alexander VI. commissioned Ferdinand the Catholic to have Christianity introduced into America, and charged him to have the Pope's *suzerainty* recognized there, as that of Eugene IV. and Calixtus III. had been in the case of those countries that might be discovered in Africa.[1] Alexander VI. did not stop here; he sent the Vicar of the Franciscans, with twelve friars of the same Order, who were subsequently joined by a number of Dominicans, into Spain, whence they were to proceed to America. Their mission of *love* and peace was, in a great measure, frustrated by *the cruelty of the Spaniards*,[2] which, bad enough at best, has been shamelessly exaggerated. The claims of the neophytes to the sacred rights of humanity had no abler advocates than the *Dominicans*, through whose labors the virtue of the Gospel bore fruit even in this unpropitious land.

---

[1] *Raynald.* ad an. 1443, nro. 10; an. 1454, nro. 8 sq.; an. 1455, nro. 7 sq.; an. 1493, nro. 18, 19, 24 sq. Cf. *Robertson*, Hist. of Amer., Lond. 1772, and oftener; transl. into Germ., by *Schiller*, Lps. 1781, Pt. I., p. 46 sq. **Junkmann*, The Discovery of America, and the Church (Cath. Magazin., Münster, 1846). **Margraf*, The Church and Slavery, since the Discovery of America, Tübg. 1865.

[2] Even the *French Encyclopaedists* here defend the Spaniards. The eminent French national economist and well-informed traveler, *M. Chevalier*, says: "In

Through the untiring exertions of the heroic *de las Casas*,[1] afterward Bishop of *Chiapa*, supported by the earlier ordinances and vigorous measures of Cardinal *Ximenes*, *Charles V.* was brought to enact a law securing the natives in their personal freedom. This law subsequently afforded an occasion and a pretext for carrying on an infamous *slave-traffic* on the coast of Africa; but to accuse the noble missionary, the great *Apostle of the Indians*, who, in the course of his missionary life, had been ceaseless in his exertions to ameliorate their condition, and had sixteen times braved the perils of the ocean to plead their cause, of having advised the substitution of the black for the red race in the labor of the mines and sugar-plantations, and of having been thus the author of the slave-trade, which is known to have existed long previously, is a cruel and outrageous calumny. The far-seeing *Ximenes*, whom his contemporaries honored as a statesman, warrior, scholar, and saint, at once interdicted the importation of slaves into America.

Europe the view was current, that the red race had been exterminated by the cruelty of the Spanish conquerors. The philosophers of the eighteenth century, burning with hatred of Catholicity, made it their object to demean this eminently Catholic nation, and to represent the conquistadores, together with the Spanish clergy, as avaricious and blood-thirsty tigers. I, for one, am not afraid to maintain that the Spaniards were no brutal destroyers, but rather efficient instruments of civilization among the red race; that their policy, upon the whole, had a *democratic*, a popular tendency." (Letters from North America, 1836, 2 vols.; Germ. transl., Lps. 1837, 4 vols.) As to the influence of Ximenes, see his biography, by *Hefele*, p. 504 sq.

[1] *Bartholomé de las Casas*, Brevissima Relacion de la Destruicion de las Indias, 1552, 4to (Lat. 1614, Germ. 1665, and other Europ. lang.) *Weise*, Las Casas (*Illgen's* Journal of Hist. Theol., 1834, Vol. IV., nro. 1). *Freiburg* Cyclop., art. *Casas*.

§ 297. *Retrospect of the Influence Exercised by the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages.*

To understand precisely the character of this influence, it will be only necessary to compare the intellectual and moral condition of the Middle Ages at the opening and close of the present period. From this comparison, it will be clear that in the interval everything had undergone a change. Instead of savage hordes, ceaselessly at war with each other; instead of deserts, morasses, and forests; instead of the darkness that was upon the whole north of Europe at the beginning of this era, we shall find, at the end of the Middle Ages, all the northern nations yielding a joyful obedience to the Gospel of Christ, lands everywhere reclaimed and in a high state of cultivation, governments well organized, social order solidly established, and an active intercourse existing among all peoples.[1] The daring spirit of European enterprise discovered the other half of the habitable globe, which opened up new and abundant sources of material prosperity and intellectual enjoyment. The humble, obscure, and neglected schools existing at the opening of the twelfth century were converted, by the pious zeal of their founders and their successors, into great and populous seats of learning, whence issued refined scholars, erudite savans, and accomplished literary men, to carry into every corner of Europe and to diffuse with unwearied activity the wealth of their knowledge and the light of their wisdom. Sixty-six universities, of which sixteen belonged to Germany, existed in Europe before the year 1517. These universities, all the legitimate outgrowth of the genius of Christianity, gave rise to Scholasticism, a science at once subtle and profound, which compels admiration equally for loftiness of conception and refinement of speculation, resembling, in this respect, those grand old Gothic cathedrals, the products of the same genius, in which one knows not which to admire more, boldness of design or delicacy of execution. *The art*

---

[1] †*Moehler*, Miscellanea, Vol. II., p. 5 sq.; Theol. *Review* of *Freiburg*, Vol. I., p. 114 sq.

of writing history was cultivated side by side with scholastic speculation.

In every European country, there flourished, at an early day, one or more distinguished *historians*. Even Iceland had her spirited *Snorro Sturleson*. Poetry kept pace with history. The voice of the bard, the trouvere, and the troubadour might be heard in cabin and castle and palace. Religious hymns and songs, inspired by faith, which, for vigor of thought, terseness of expression, and musical rhythm, will compare favorably with any similar productions of modern times, resounded through the aisles and along the vaulted ceilings of village churches and majestic cathedrals. Closely allied to poetry are the splendid triumphs of *Christian architecture*, which we now gaze upon with amazement, whose very conceptions our minds are unable to grasp, and whose vast proportions bring home to us, in unmistakable language, the consciousness of our inferiority.

When the human mind had ceased to follow in the direction hitherto pursued by speculative theology, because this was no longer adequate to the wants of the age, *the love of classic literature* revived, *the study of the Greek and Roman authors* opened out new avenues of thought, furnished fresh material to the intellect, *now prepared by long years of preceding labor* to enter upon its new sphere, and the whole world set enthusiastically about acquiring a knowledge of those ancient works which the enlightened zeal of the monks had preserved. Nay, more; from whatever side the Middle Ages are viewed, they present an aspect of unapproachable grandeur.

Animated and pervaded by a spirit unmistakably Christian, which led to an alliance between the *priesthood* and the *empire*, they hastened the march of civilization; called into existence, or rather transformed the institution of chivalry, thereby developing in man the principle of honor; created a unity of sympathy and feeling among diverse nations, and, through the *Crusades*, gave them an impulse whose influence was felt for centuries; inspired Christians with the virtues of courage and resignation, without which the *Mendicant Orders* could never have existed; ennobled the arts by dedicating them to the service of religion; softened and refined men and manners; triumphantly opposed the aggressions of brute force; abolished servitude slowly indeed, but effectually, and everywhere produced saints, heroes, scholars, artists, and patterns for all grades of society and every walk of life.

Is it possible that a Church which accomplished triumphs so great and so numerous, in the midst of circumstances so trying and difficult, and which successfully united in *one* single family nations dissimilar and sometimes antagonistic, should not call up in us deep and sincere feelings of love, respect, gratitude, and joy? But the joy is mingled with sorrow. Evil times threaten; there are breakers ahead. Spiritual life is chilled, discipline is relaxed, voices are raised in warning, but pass unheeded, and noble but ineffectual efforts are put forth to save the Church and reform her *head and members.* The Christian historian is borne down with pain and sorrow in beholding pontiffs, by their questionable lives and abuse of their high office, bringing dishonor upon the Church, snapping the bond uniting Christian people, and turning a deaf ear to the warning voice of saintly men who have the interests and well-being of the Church at heart. Were anything wanting to heighten the intensity of his grief, it might be found in the degeneracy of the regular and secular clergy and their baneful influence upon the religious life and morals of the laity. He looks about him, and, seeing the spirit of revolt steadily gaining strength, he reads the signs of the times, and the fearful thought is borne in upon his mind that a tremendous catastrophe is at hand. Turning his view from the present to the past, as if desirous of moving the great hand of time back a few centuries, his gaze sweeps over the vast theater where so many splendid achievements have been accomplished, and, contemplating the society of that age, when it was still *one* in spirit and form, one in faith and morals, and one in its religious and political institutions, he cries out, in the words of a contemporary writer:[1] "Beautiful and memorable epoch, when Europe was still a Christian country, all its provinces bound together by one common interest, and governed by a *single* chief, the supreme arbiter of kingdoms, yet possessing only an inconsiderable one himself. No better proof can be given or required of the beneficent influence exercised by the spiritual government, or of its adaptability to the wants of the times, than the fact that under its inspiration every human energy leaped into life, every enterprise was successful, individuals achieved splendid triumphs in science, art, and politics, and an active intercourse, spiritual and commercial, was maintained among nations, from one end of the earth to the other, thus constituting them all members of the great Christian family. That Germany was great and powerful during the Middle Ages, as long as the Church and the Empire were in alliance, is a fact as significant as it is undeniable.

---

[1] *Novalis* (Prince Hardenberg), Christendom or Europe, fragment written in 1799. Cf. also the beautiful poem of *Luitpolt of Bebenburg*, in *Böhmer*, Fontes rer. Germ., T. I., vers. fin.

END OF VOLUME SECOND.

I. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

POPES AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS,

Being a continuation of Vol. I., p. 769.

POPES.	EMPERORS.
John VI. 701–705.	Tiberius III. 698–705.
John VII. 705–707.	Justinian II., once more Emperor, 705–711.
Sisinnius, 708.	
Constantine, 708–715.	Philippicus Bardanes, 711–713.
St. * *Gregory II.* 715–731.	Anastasius II. 713–716.
" * *Gregory III.* 731–741.	Theodosius III. 716, 717.
" *Zachary,* 741–752.	Leo III. (the Isaurian) 717–741.
Stephen II. 752, died without having been consecrated. Is not counted by the majority of historians.	Constantine V. (Copronymus) 741–775.
**Stephen III.* 752–757.	
St. Paul I. 757–767.	
Stephen IV. 768–772.	Leo IV. 775–780.
**Hadrian I.* 772–795.	Constantine VI. 780–797.
St. Leo III. 795–816.	Empress Irene, 797–802.*
Stephen V. 816.	GERMAN EMPERORS.
St. Paschal I. 817–824.	Charlemagne, 800–814.
Eugene II. 824–827.	Louis the Mild, 814–840.
Valentine, 827.	
Gregory IV. 827–844.	Lothaire I. 840–855.
Sergius II. 844–847.	
St. Leo IV. 847–855.	Louis II. 855–875.
No Popess Joane.	
Benedict III. 855–858.	
St. Nicholas I. (the Great) 858–867.	
" Hadrian II. 867–872.	
John VIII. 872–882.	Charles II. (the Bald) 875–877.

---

* The last East Roman Emperors were descended from the dynasty of the *Palaeologi*, from Michael Palaeologus (since July, 1261) to John VIII. (1425–1448) and Constantine XI. (1448–1453.)

POPES.	EMPERORS.
Marinus I. 882–884.	Charles III. (the Fat) 881–887.
Hadrian III. 884, 885.	
Stephen VI. 885–891.	Guido, 891–894, and Lambert, 894–896.
Formosus, 891–896.	
Boniface VI. 896 (15 days).	Arnulph, 896–899.
Stephen VII. 896, 897.	
Romanus, 897.	
Theodore II. 897 or 898.	
John IX. 898–900.	
Benedict IV. 900–903.	Louis III. (the Child) 900–911.
Leo V. 903.	
Christopher, 903.	
Sergius III. 904–911.	
Anastasius III. 911–913.	Conrad I. 911–918.
Lando, 913.	
John X. 914–928.	Henry I. 919–936.
Leo VII. 928.	
Stephen VIII. 929–931.	
John XI. 931–936.	
Leo VI. 936–939.	Otho I. 936–973.
Stephen IX. 939–942.	
Marinus II. 943–946.	
Agapete II. 946–955.	
John XII. 956–964.	
(Leo VIII. 963, Benedict V. 964, Antipopes.)	
John XIII. 965–972.	
Benedict VI. 972–974.	Otho II. 973–983.
(Boniface (Franco) VII. 974,) Here, probably, no pope Domnus or Donus.	
Benedict VII. 974–983.	
John XIV. 983–984.	
John XV. 984–996.	
Gregory V. 996–999 (1st Germ. Pope).	Otho III. 996–1002.
(John XVI. 997, Antipope).	
Sylvester II. 999–1003 (1st French Pope).	Henry II. 1002–1024.
John XVII. 1003.	
John XVIII. 1003–1009.	
Sergius IV. 1009–1012.	
Benedict VIII. 1012–1024.	
John XIX. 1024–1033.	Conrad II. 1024–1039.
Benedict IX. 1033–1044.	
Gregory VI. 1044–1046.	Henry III. 1039–1056.
Clement II. 1046, 1047 (2d German Pope).	
Damasus II. 1048 (23 days; 3d German Pope).	

POPES.	EMPERORS.
St. **Leo IX.* 1049–1054 (4th German Pope).	
Victor II. 1055-1057 (5th German Pope).	
Stephen X. 1057, 1058 (6th German Pope).	Henry IV. 1056–1106.
**Nicholas II.* 1058–1061 (7th German Pope).	
**Alexander II.* 1061–1073 (Honorius II., Antipope).	
**St. Gregory VII.* 1073–1085.	
Victor III. 1086, 1087.	
Urban II. 1088–1099.	
Paschal II. 1099–1118.	Henry V. 1106–1125.
Gelasius II. 1118.	
Calixtus II. 1119–1124.	
Honorius II. 1124–1130.	Lothaire II. 1125–1137.
Innocent II. 1130–1143.	Conrad III. 1137–1152.
Celestine II. 1143.	
Lucius II. 1144, 1145.	
St. Eugene III. 1145-1153.	Frederic I. 1152–1190.
Anastasius IV. 1153, 1154.	
Hadrian IV. 1154–1159 (an Englishman).	
**Alexander III.* 1159–1181.	
Lucius III. 1181–1185.	
Urban III. 1185–1187.	
Gregory VIII. 1187.	
Clement III. 1187–1191.	Henry VI. 1190–1197.
Celestine III. 1191–1198.	Philip of Suabia, and Otho IV. 1198–1208.
**Innocent III.* 1198–1216.	Otho IV. alone, 1208–1215.
Honorius III. 1216–1227.	Frederic II. 1215–1250.
Gregory IX. 1227–1241.	
Celestine IV. 1241 (17 days).	
Innocent IV. 1243–1254.	Conrad IV. 1250–1254.
Alexander IV. 1254–1261.	Interregnum, 1254–1273.
Urban IV. 1261–1264.	
Clement IV. 1264–1268.	
Bl. Gregory X. 1271–1276.	Rudolph of Hapsburg, 1273–1291.
Innocent V. 1276 (a Frenchman).	
Hadrian V. 1276 (38 days).	
John XXI. (XX.) 1276, 1277 (a Portuguese).	
Nicholas III. 1277–1280.	
Martin IV. 1281–1285 (a Frenchman).	
Honorius IV. 1285–1287.	
Nicholas IV. 1288–1292.	Adolph of Nassau, 1292–1298.

POPES.	EMPERORS.
St. Celestine V. 1294, resigns voluntarily, † 1296.	
Boniface VIII. 1294–1303.	Albert I. 1298–1308.
Bl. Benedict XI. 1303, 1304.	
Popes of Avignon (Frenchmen).	
Clement V. 1305–1314.	Henry VII. 1308–1313.
John XXII. 1316–1334.	Louis the Bavarian, 1313–1347, and Frederic of Austria, 1314–1330.
Benedict XII. 1334–1342.	
Clement VI. 1342–1352.	Charles IV. 1347–1378.
Innocent VI. 1352–1362.	
St. Urban V. 1362–1370.	
Gregory XI. 1370–1378.	
Popes at Rome and Avignon.	
Urban VI. 1378–1389.	Wenceslaus, 1378–1400.
(Clement VII. at Avignon, 1378–1394).	
Boniface IX. 1389–1404.	Rupert of the Palatinate, 1400–1410.
(At Avignon, Benedict XIII. 1394–1417).	
Innocent VII. 1404–1406.	
Gregory XII. 1406–1409.	
Alexander V. 1409, 1410, elected by the Council of Pisa.	Sigismund, 1410–1437.
John XXIII. 1410–1415, deposed by the Council of Constance, May 29, 1415; so likewise Benedict XIII., April 1, 1417, and Gregory XII., resigned voluntarily.	
Martin V. 1417–1431.	
Eugene IV., 1431–1447 (Felix V. Antipope, 1439–1448).	Albert II. 1438, 1439.
Nicholas V. 1448–1455.	Frederic III. 1440–1493.
Calixtus III. 1455–1458 (a Spaniard).	
Pius II. 1458–1464.	
Paul II. 1464–1471.	
Sixtus IV. 1471–1484.	
Innocent VIII. 1484–1492.	
Alexander VI. 1492–1503 (a Spaniard).	Maximilian I. 1493–1519.
Pius III. 1503.	
Julius II. 1503–1513.	
Leo X. 1513–1521.	

II. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAGES AND EVENTS DURING THE SECOND PERIOD (700–1517), FIRST EPOCH (700–1073).

DIONYSIAN ERA.

711. Invasion of Spain by the Saracens.

718. Winfried (St. Boniface) is authorized by Gregory II. (715–731) to evangelize the Germans (718). His labors in Friesland, Thuringia, and Hessia.

723. Before his consecration at Rome he takes the oath to the Pope. As bishop he takes the name of Boniface.

726. The Greek emperor, Leo III. the Isaurian, issues an edict against the veneration of images. Corbinian founds the bishopric of Freisingen and becomes its first bishop († 730).

732. Victory of Charles Martel over the Arabs at Tours. Gregory III. raises Boniface to the archiepiscopal dignity, and assigns to him Mentz as his metropolitan see, with thirteen suffragans (738). Synodal jurisdiction (*Testes Syonadales.*) Special penitentiary discipline. Cases of conscience.

735. Death of Venerable Bede, the most learned man of his age.

741–752. Pope Zachary saves Rome from the ravages of Luitprand and Rachis, kings of Lombardy (745 and 750). Death of Charles Martel in 741. Reigns of his sons Pepin and Carloman.

742. Holding of the first German Council under the presidency of Boniface, who makes all the bishops take the oath of fidelity to the Pope. Ecclesiastics are forbidden to bear arms.

744. St. Boniface and his disciple, Sturm, found the monastery of Fulda.

752–768. Pepin, king of the Franks, is recognized by Pope Zachary and anointed by Boniface. Stephen II., Pope (752–757), is severely harassed by the Lombards. He applies for aid to Pepin, whom he also anoints at St. Denys, and nominates *Patritius*—i. e., Protector and Advocate of the Roman Church (753).

754. The Council of Constantinople condemns image-worship. St. John Damascene, the last great name in the literature of the Greek Church, dies shortly after. Pepin the Patritius descends into Italy against Aistolphus, first in 754, and again in 756. In consequence of these expeditions the estates of the Church and the Roman Republic are restored.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

755. St. Boniface, having transferred his bishopric to his disciple Lullus, is martyred among the Frieslanders.

C. 760. The Rule of Chrodegang of Metz is adopted for the secular clergy.

768–814. Intimate relations of Charlemagne and Hadrian I. (772–795.)

774. Pope Hadrian authorizes Heddo, bishop of Strasburg, to divide his diocese into seven archdeaconries. *Capitula ruralia* had existed long before, under the supervision of archpriests. Expedition of Charlemagne against the Desiderius king of the Lombards; he adds to the donation of his father.

779. Charlemagne publishes a law establishing the tithe.

780–814. To facilitate the conversion of the Saxons (772), Charlemagne founds the bishoprics of Osnabrück, Verden, Bremen (Willehad, Bishop, † 788), Minden, Münster (803), Seligenstadt, Hildesheim (Elze). Ludger, first bishop of Münster († 809). In 809, the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle uses the term "*Filioque.*"

787. *Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nice* convenes to defend the veneration of images.

790. Canons of this council are unjustly censured in Caroline Books.

792–794. Adoptionism is condemned at Ratisbonne in 792, and again at Frankfort, 794. Image-worship is severely censured. Alcuin publishes his *Libellus adversus haeresin Felicis* (Adoptionism).

796. Alcuin founds the School of Tours. Paul Warnefried (Paulus Diaconus), † 799. Alcuin and Paulinus, † 804.

800. Having put an end to the kingdom of the Lombards, Charlemagne renews his donation at the Tomb of St. Peter, and is crowned Emperor by Pope Leo III., who thus re-establishes the Empire of the West on a thorough Christian basis. From this time forth Charlemagne assumes the title of "*devotus sanctae Ecclesiae defensor humilisque adjutor.*

813. Councils of Châlons-sur-Saône, Arles, Mentz, Rheims, and Tours. *Capitularia interrogationis.*

814–840. Charlemagne († 814) is succeeded by Louis the Mild. Death of Leo III., 816. Pashal I. (817–824.) After the death of Charlemagne, his secretary, Eginhard, quits court.

816, 817. Diet and Council of Aix-la-Chapelle. Chiefly through the efforts of Amalric of Metz, the clergy accept the Rule of Chrodegang. Agobard is made Archbishop of Lyons. Monastic reform of St. Benedict of Aniane. Death of Benedict of Aniane, and Theodulph of Orleans, 821.

822, 827, 831. Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, and the monk Halitgar are appointed to go as missionaries into Denmark and Northern Europe by the diet of Attigny (822). Activity and successes of Ansgar and Autbert in Denmark and Sweden (827, 831, 853).

827–848. Gregory IV. Pope. Difficulties of his position arising out of his relations to the revolted sons of Louis the Mild. False Isidorian decretals.

831. Louis the Mild founds the Archbishopric of Hamburg, of which Ansgar becomes first archbishop. Paschasius Radbert, *de corpore*

et sanguine. Commencement of the controversy on the Eucharist, in which the most prominent names are Ratramnus; Heriger, Abbot of Lobbes; Rhabanus Maurus; Amalric of Metz; Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt; and still later, Scotus Erigena.

834. The emperor, Louis the Mild, having been unjustly deposed by his sons (833), and condemned to do public penance, is again placed upon the throne by Louis and Pepin.

841–843. After the death of Louis the Mild (840), his sons engage in battle at Fontenay, where Lothaire, the eldest, is defeated. This battle is followed by the treaty of Verdun (843), between Lothaire as emperor, on the one hand, and on the other, Louis, king of Germany, and Charles the Bald, king of Western France. Death of Jonas, Bishop of Orleans.

842. Council of Constantinople confirms the enactments of the council of Nice, concerning the veneration of images. The Feast of Orthodoxy is established to commenorate the event.

847–855. Leo IV. Pope.

848, 849. The error of the monk Gottschalk, concerning predestination, is condemned by the council of Mentz (848), presided over by Rhabanus Maurus; and by that of Crécy (849), presided over by the celebrated Hincmar of Rheims. Walafried Strabo publishes the *Glossa ordinaria in Biblia* († 849). Second council of Crécy (843); *Quatuor capitula Carisiacensia.* Dangerous theories of Scotus Erigena.

855. Leo IV. dies, and is succeeded by Benedict III. (855–858), thus leaving no interval to the reign of the famous female pope, Joan. Rhabanus Maurus († 856).

858–867. Nicholas I. the Great; his contest with King Lothaire II.; he deposes the archbishops Günther of Trèves and Thietgaud of Cologne, and excommunicates the members of a council. Deposition of Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, and usurpation of Photius.

863. Methodius and Cyril evangelize the Moravians. Nicholas I. deposes Photius and recognizes Ignatius. The union of the Church of Bulgaria with Rome (866) still further alienates from each other the Churches of the East and the West.

867. Photius excommunicates the Pope in the council of Constantinople. The emperor Basil, the Macedonian, declares for Ignatius (867–886). Hadrian II. Pope (867–872). The council of Rome annuls the canons of the council of Constantinople.

869. *Eighth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople* convoked to pass judgment on the quarrel between Photius and Ignatius; the former and his adherents are excommunicated. Ignatius dies in 878. The council recognizes Photius as patriarch (879–880). He is again banished and dies in exile (891).

871–901. *Alfred the Great, King of England,* delivers his country from the yoke of the Danes (880), and carries out reforms equally bene-

DIONYSIAN ERA.

ficial to Church and State. John VIII. Pope (872–882). Anastasius, Abbot and Librarian of the Roman Church (C. 870).

881–888. Charles the Fat chosen and crowned emperor by the Pope. Quarrel of this prince with Pope Stephen VI. (885–891.) Leo VI. the Philosopher, Greek emperor (886–911).

Bet. 870 and 880 or 895. Baptism of Borziwoi, duke of Bohemia, by Methodius. Borziwoi, and his wife, St. Ludmilla, abdicate toward the end of their lives on account of the resistance encountered in endeavoring to introduce Christianity. St. Wenceslaus (928–938) and Boleslaus II. (from 967) prepare the triumph of Christianity. Shortly after (967), Pope John XII. recognizes and establishes the bishopric of Prague.

888–962. The death of Charles the Fat is followed by the complete disorganization of his states. The humiliation and misfortunes of the Holy See occasioned by its subjection to the powerful house of Tuscany. Otho I. puts an end to this condition of things.

909. Councils of Metz and Trosly convene to check the decline of religious life and public morality.

910. The abbot Berno founds the monastery of Clugny; he is succeeded by many abbots of great virtue, such as Aymar, Maiolus, and especially Odilo (994–1048).

955. The Russian princess, Olga (Helena), is baptized at Constantinople. Her grandson, Wladimir the Great (980–1014), labors to establish the Christian Church among the Russians; the work is accomplished by his son Jaroslaus (1019–1054). Kiew is raised to the rank of a metropolitan see, and the monastery of the Catacombs (Peczersky), in which the monk Nestor wrote his Annals in the vernacular (1056–1111), is founded.

962. Restoration of the empire, after a break of forty-eight years, in the person of Otho the Great, who, before being crowned, promises to protect the Church of Rome and her head, John XII. Saxon emperors: Otho I. (936–973); Otho II. (973–983); Otho III. (983–1002). The symbolical imperial globe.

963. John XII., degraded and dishonored, is irregularly deposed. Leo VIII. is equally irregularly elected. The election of Benedict by the Romans still further complicates the difficulties of the schism. Otho has John XIII. (965–972) recognized as lawful Pope. Atto of Vercelli (945–960); Ratherius of Verona († 974). Luitprand, Bishop of Cremona, dies (970).

966. The Polish duke, Mieczyslaw, at the instance of his wife, Dombrowka, is baptized, and founds the first bishopric of Posen, of which the first bishop was Jordan, who was made a suffragan of the newly created archbishop of Magdeburg from 970. Flodoard of Rheims († 966).

968. Otho I. founds the archbishoprics of Magdeburg as a center of unity for the new bishoprics of Meissen (965), Merseburg and Zeitz (955), Havelburg (946), and Brandenburg (949). In 971, Otho I. sends Christian missionaries to the grand-duchess Olga.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

969. The council of London; enlightened zeal of St. Dustan, Archbishop of Canterbury, for the reformation of the clergy. Turketul, and the bishops Oswald and Ethelwold.

972–997. Geisa, duke of Hungary, yielding to the suggestions of his wife, Sarolta, commences to introduce Christianity into his states. It is established there by St. Stephen (997–1038).

973. Death of Otho the Great. Fresh troubles at Rome. Imprisonment and murder of Benedict VI., recognized as Pope by Otho II. Crescentius, son of Theodora, and Cardinal Boniface Franco. Hroswitha, nun of Gandersheim, dies (984). In the Greek Church, death of Simeon Metaphrastes (C. 977).

983–1002. Pope John XV. invites the emperor Otho III. into Italy, and having died while the latter was still in the country, Gregory V., a German (996–999), is elected his successor, chiefly through the influence of Otho. Intimate relations between the Pope and the Emperor. Insurrection of the Wends under Mistewoi (983). Oecumenius, Bishop of Tricca, in Thessaly, writes an excellent exegetical work (C. 990). The Commemoration of All Souls celebrated at Clugny (998). John XV. canonizes Ulrich, Bishop of Augsburg; this being the first instance of a canonization by a Pope (993).

999–1003. Gerbert is elected Pope, and takes the name of Sylvester II. Extent of his power. First idea of the Crusades advanced in his *Epistola ex persona Hierosolymae vastatae ad universalem Ecclesiam.*

1002–1024. St. Henry II. Benedict VIII. elected Pope by the Tuscan party (1012–1024). He is driven from Rome; seeks an asylum with Henry, by whom he is again restored to his see, and whom he crowns emperor in Rome (1014). Canute the Great, king of Denmark (1014–1034). St. Olaf establishes Christianity in Norway (1017–1033), and the grand-duke, Wladimir the Great, is equally successful in his efforts to introduce it into Russia († 1014).

1017. Romuald founds the order of Camaldolites. Notker-Labeo, abbot of St. Gall († 1022). The council of Seligenstadt is held in the same year. About the same time, the celebrated school of Liége flourishes under the direction of Notker, Bishop of that city († 1007). He is succeeded by Wazo, equally zealous in the cause of education. Burkhard, Bishop of Würzburg (1025, 1026). Fulberd, Bishop of Chartres, and disciple of Gerbert's († 1029). Ditmar becomes bishop of Merseburg in 1008, and dies in 1018.

1032. The French bishops oppose the practice of making war, and their cry of "Peace! peace!" resounds in numerous councils.

1038. John Gualbert founds the order of Vallombrosa.

1046. The council of Sutri, which, thanks to the intervention of Henry III., the second Franconian emperor (Conrad II. was the first), puts an end to the rivalries of the three contending Popes, John XIX., Benedict IX., and Gregory VI. The emperor subsequently secures the election of Luidger, Bishop of Bamberg, who as Pope

DIONYSIAN ERA.

takes the name of Clement II. (1046, 1047.) After Clement's death, Benedict again commences his guilty intrigues. Henry III. designates as Pope the bishop of Brixen, who reigns only twenty-three days (1048).

1048–1054. Leo IX. Pope; his efforts to put down simony and correct the unchastity of the clergy. *Liber Gomorrhianus* of Peter Damian. Influence of Hildebrand upon the Holy See. Death of Luitpold (1049), Archbishop of Mentz, a very important event for Germany.

1050. Berengarius is condemned in the councils of Rome and Vercelli. Lanfranc the Scholastic, abbot of Bec.

1054. Berengarius deceives Hildebrand at the council of Tours, but an end is put to the controversy by the council of Rome (1059). The rupture caused by Michael Caerularius becomes a formal schism, in consequence of the positive declaration made by the papal legates (July 16, 1054). Fruitless efforts of Theophylactus, Archbishop of Achrida, and Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, to prevent the schism.

1055–1057. Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstädt, is raised to the pontifical throne by the influence of Henry III. He takes the name of Victor II. Death of Henry in 1056. Victor endeavors to secure the throne of Germany for the young prince, Henry IV. (1056–1106.) Sanguinary contest occasioned at Milan by simony and clerical concubinage.

1057–1058. Stephen IX. (X.) raises Peter Damian to the Cardinalate, and bestows upon him the bishopric of Ostia. Peter at once commences an open war against simonists and concubinaries. After the death of Stephen X., the wicked portion of the clergy and the Tusculan party bring about the election of Benedict X.; but the party in favor of reform soon triumphs and elects.

1058–1061. Nicholas II. Pope, who, to prevent the recurrence of irregular and stormy elections, has a canon passed in the council of Rome (1059), which was probably enlarged by other enactments of the council held at Rome in 1061. Nicholas II. bestows Calabria and Apulia in fief upon the Norman duke, Robert Guiscard.

1061–1073. Alexander II. elected without the assent of the emperor, who raises up Honorius II. as Antipope. The latter is not able to maintain himself. The celebrated "*Disceptatio inter regis advocatum et Romanae Ecclesiae defensorem*" by Peter Damian († 1072). Benno, Bishop of Meissen, an apostle of the Slaves, dies in 1106.

1069. Abbot William founds at Hirschau a congregation on the model of that of Clugny. Gottschalk, grandson of Mistewoi, and founder of the bishoprics of Mecklenburg and Ratzeburg, is assassinated by the Pagans in 1066.

1070. Lanfranc becomes bishop of Canterbury.

SECOND EPOCH (1073-1517).

PART FIRST.

(FROM THE ACCESSION OF GREGORY VII. TO THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII., A. D. 1073-1303.)

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1073-1085. Gregory VII. His struggle for the enfranchisement of mind; rise of Universities under the special influence and protection of the Church. Rise of Scholasticism. The Seljuks in Palestine (1073).

1074-1075. Councils held at Rome against simony, concubinage, and lay-investiture. Strong reaction sets in against these abuses, and is manifested both in controversial writings and in practice.

1076-1077. Henry IV. has Gregory VII. deposed by the Council of Worms. The latter in turn excommunicates and deposes the Emperor. The diet of Tribur (October, 1076) obliges the Emperor to go to Canossa, where he does penance from the 25th to the 27th of January, 1077. Heated controversy for and against the Emperor and the Pope.

1080. Growing complaints against Henry IV. Gregory recognizes the anti-king, Rudolph, and confers investiture on Robert Guiscard. Henry choses as his antipope Clement III., and Herman of Salm succeeds to Rudolph, slain in the battle of Merseburg (1081).

1085. Exertions at the diet of Gerstungen to heal these divisions, not by the sword, but by science. Death of Gregory, May 25th. St. Bruno founds the Carthusian Order (1084).

1088-1099. Urban II., the successor to Victor III. (1086-1087), boldly pursues the policy of Gregory VII., and threatens with interdict lay-investitures. Conrad, the eldest son of Henry IV., revolts against his father.

1095. Clergy are forbidden by the Council of Clermont to take the oath of fealty by placing their hands between those of laymen. Enthusiasm for the Crusade; Peter the Hermit; Jerusalem recovered July 15, 1099, and Godfrey of Bouillon proclaimed King. Institution of the Knights of St. John. St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (1093-1109), combats Roscelin, canon of Compiègne. Controversy on Nominalism and Realism.

1098. Council of Bari in Apulia convened to define precisely th epoints of difference between the Greek and Roman Churches. Robert founds the Order of Citeaux, whose chief importance is to be ascribed to St. Bernard of Clairvaux, since 1113.

1109-1118. Paschal II. continues the controversy on investitures against Henry V. (1106-1125), and manifests an extremely conciliatory disposi-

DIONYSIAN ERA.

tion by accepting the treaty of 1111, with a view to the freedom of the Church; his advances are obstinately resisted, and he finds himself engaged in a heated controversy, in consequence of which he is constrained to make a formal retraction in the Council of Rome (1112), and the third treaty with Henry is annulled.

1109. William of Champeaux founds the Abbey of St. Victor. His disputation with Abelard on Nominalism.

1118–1119. Gelasius II. Foundation of the Order of Templars at Jerusalem.

1119–1124. Callixtus II. St. Norbert founds the Order of Premonstratensians (1120). Council of Soissons, in which Abelard is condemned (1121).

1123. NINTH ECUMENICAL, or first General COUNCIL of Lateran, which confirms the concordat of Worms, concerning investitures, concluded between the Pope and the Emperor; calls attention to the wretched condition of the Christians in the East and in Spain, and promulgates disciplinary canons. Otho, bishop of Bamberg, missionary in Pomerania (1124).

1124–1130. Honorius II., Pope; Lothaire II., Emperor (1125–1137). New regulations concerning investitures. Lothaire goes twice to Rome to make some arrangements satisfactory to Innocent II. (1130–1143), successor to Honorius II. Anacletus II., antipope; reëstablishment of the ancient Senate. Under Lucius II. (1144–1145), republicanism is revived, and the dignity of "*Patricius*" is almost immediately established. Arnold of Brescia is still more extreme in his measures. St. Bernard.

1139. TENTH ECUMENICAL, or second General COUNCIL of Lateran, which confirms the peace of the Church under Innocent, and condemns Peter of Bruis and Arnold of Brescia. Council of Sens against Abelard († 1142). Gilbert de la Porrée, Bishop of Poitiers since 1142. Robert Pulleyne. *Four Books of Sentences* by Peter Lombard, appear about 1140. Hugh of St. Victor (1141).

1145–1153. Eugene III. resists the republican frenzy of the Romans, and is sustained by his friend St. Bernard, through whose influence Conrad III. participates in the second Crusade (1147). The Council of Rheims condemns Henry of Lausanne and Eudes de l'Étoile (1148). St. Hildegard. St. Bernard's book *De Consideratione ad Eugenium III.* (1148–1152.) Both die the following year—Pope Eugene, July 8th; St. Bernard, Doctor of the Church, August 20th. The *Decretum Gratiani* appears about 1152.

1152–1190. Emperor Frederic Barbarossa (Hohenstaufen) aims at universal monarchy and asserts his claim to imperial rights in the pagan sense; the great Popes, Hadrian IV. (1154–1159) and Alexander III. (1159–1181) energetically resist his pretensions. Antipopes raised up by the Emperor. Hadrian IV. issues his bull concerning Ireland (c. 1155). Berthold of Calabria founds the Order of Mount Carmel, or of the Carmelites, about 1156.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1158. Diet of Roncaglia, attended by Frederic Barbarossa, and the four famous jurisconsults, Bulgarus, Martin Gosia, James, and Hugh. Richard, prior of St. Victor (1162–1173).

1164. St. Thomas à Becket is unable in the Council of Clarendon to prevent Henry II. from carrying out his designs of enslaving the Church, and in consequence appeals to the Pope. He is exiled, returns in triumph, and is murdered at the foot of the altar, December 29, 1170. Gerhohus of Reichersberg († 1169). A. D. 1171, Alexander III. confirms Hadrian's bull concerning Ireland, and the whole Irish hierarchy accept its conditions. Minnesingers (1170–1250).

1179. *Eleventh Ecumenical,* or Third Lateran *Council.* New decree of Alexander III. on papal elections, requiring a two-third vote of the college of Cardinals for the validity of a Pope's election. Condemnation of the Waldenses and Albigenses. Disciplinary canons. John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres († 1182).

1189–1190. Frederic Barbarossa undertakes the third crusade at the instance of Gregory VIII. (1187.) Philip Augustus and Richard Coeur de Lion accompany the Emperor on the expedition, which, owing to the division among the princes, is only partially successful. Capture of Saint Jean d'Acre in 1191; a truce for three years is concluded in 1192. Walpot of Bassen founds the Teutonic Order in 1190.

1190–1197. Henry VI., son of Frederic, becomes Emperor. Popes Clement III. (1188–1191) and Celestine III. (1191–1198.) The Schoolman, Alanus of Ryssel (*ab Insulis*), Bishop of Auxerre, develops his comprehensive and independent system († 1202). Meinhard, bishop of Livonia († 1196).

1198–1216. Innocent III., guardian of Frederic II., has his ward highly educated. Wonderful activity and influence of this Pope throughout the whole of Europe; his solicitude about the Holy Sepulchre. He opposes the establishment of the Latin Empire at Constantinople, which lasts from 1204–1261. Children's crusade.

1204. Amalric of Bena, the pantheist sectary, whose views and tendencies are propagated by David of Dinanto and the Brothers and Sisters of the Free-Spirit.

1209. A crusade is preached in France against the evergrowing heresy of the Albigenses. It is headed by Simon of Montfort. Sacking of Béziers. Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse. Innocent III. sanctions, in 1215, the Mendicant Order of St. Francis of Assisi († October 4, 1226) and the Order of St. Dominic. Paramount importance of these orders in combating the errors of the times. Council of Paris, held in 1209, to condemn the writings of Aristotle. The Niebelungen (1210).

1215. TWELFTH ECUMENICAL, or fourth General COUNCIL of Lateran, in which the errors of Joachim de Floris, Amalric of Bena, the Albigenses, and others are condemned. Seventy very important disciplinary canons. The word *transubstantiation* employed as the most fitting to express precisely the Catholic dogma of the Eucharist. The obligation of confessing yearly and of receiving Holy Communion at Easter imposed upon all.

1215–1250. Emperor Frederic II., in his relations to the Church, disappoints the hopes at one time entertained, and his policy, at first doubtful, becomes decidedly hostile to Popes Honorius III. (1216–1227), Gregory IX. (1227–1241), and Innocent IV. (1243–1254.) By his Sicilian Code (1231), he establishes a legal despotism, and by attempting to make the Church a police institution, sets at defiance the spirit of the age. Heated discussion between the papal and imperial parties: *De tribus Impostoribus.*

1228. Frederic, notwithstanding that he was excommunicated, undertakes the fifth Crusade, after having frequently evaded the task.

1229. Council of Toulouse provides new measures for establishing an inquisition against the heretics of southern France, who are equally dangerous to Church and State. In Germany, inquisitor Conrad of Marburg is murdered (1223).

1230. Peace of San Germano between the Emperor and the Pope. Alexander of Hales (*Doctor Irrefragabilis*), the first of the Franciscan Order to hold a professor's chair in the University of Paris. The Teutonic Order is established in Prussia. *Corpus Juris Canonici* is collected by the Dominican, Raymond of Pennafort (*Decretalium Gregorii IX.* libri V., 1234).

1245. *Thirteenth Ecumenical*, or First *Council* of Lyons, endeavors to effect a reunion of the Greek and Roman Churches, and solemnly excommunicates Frederic II. Death of Alexander of Hales. St. Thomas Aquinas, Dominican. St. Bonaventure, Franciscan. Innocent IV. and St. Louis enter into negotiations with the Mongols, with a view to the conversion of the latter. Western Carmelites are enrolled among the Mendicant Orders; also the Augustinian Hermits in 1256.

1248. St. Louis undertakes the sixth Crusade against Egypt, and is made prisoner. Death of Frederic II., A. D. 1250.

1254–1261. Alexander IV. Hugo de Sto Caro, author of the first concordance († 1260). Procession of the Flagellants in Italy (1260).

1264. Urban IV. (1261–1264) institutes the feast of Corpus Christi.

1265–1268. Clement IV. Conradin, the last of the Hohenstaufens, is beheaded, notwithstanding the interposition of Clement.

1269–1270. The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis. Its authenticity is contested (1269). St. Louis undertakes the seventh and last Crusade against Tunis and Ptolemaïs in 1269.

1271–1276. Gregory X. Rudolph of Hapsburg, Emperor (1273–1291). William of Saint-Amour, the great opponent of the Mendicants and adversary of the Mendicant Orders, and likewise the celebrated preacher, Berthold of Ratisbonne, die (1272).

1274. *Fourteenth Ecumenical Council*, or Second of Lyons. Attempts at

DIONYSIAN ERA.

reunion with the Greek Church; disciplinary canons concerning ecclesiastical elections are rendered more severe. Conclave; St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and Robert, founder of the Sorbonne (1251), die in 1274. Albert the Great, master of St. Thomas († 1281).

1282–1283. Prussia is entirely subdued by the Teutonic Order in 1283. Andronicus I., Greek Emperor (1282–1328). Sicilian Vespers.

1288–1292. Nicholas IV. sends the Franciscan, John of Monte Corvino, as missionary to China. In 1291, the Christians lose Ptolemaïs, their last stronghold in Palestine. The Templars establish themselves in the island of Cyprus.

1294. Celestine V. establishes the Celestine Hermits, and dies. Death of Roger Bacon (*Doctor Mirabilis*).

1294–1303. Boniface VIII. His quarrel with Philip the Fair of France. James de Voragine († 1298). Bonifacii Sextus Decretalium, 1298.

1300. Boniface VIII. establishes the Jubilee and the indulgences connected therewith.

PART SECOND.

(FROM THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. TO THE WESTERN SCHISM, 1303–1517.)

1305–1314. Popes of Avignon. Benedict XI. succeeds Boniface VIII. (1303–1304), and after a short reign is followed by Clement V., who, in his servile submission to Philip the Fair, gives up his own see to reside at Avignon, which becomes the residence of the Popes from 1309 to 1378. *The Captivity of Babylon. Libri V. Clementinarum* are added to the *Corpus Juris.* Dolcino, leader of the Apostolicals, is burnt to death in 1307. Duns Scotus (*Doctor Subtilis*) († 1308).

1311–1312. *Fifteenth Ecumenical Council of Vienne.* The Templars are abolished at the instance of Philip the Fair. The Fratricelli, Apostolicals, Beghards, and Beguines are condemned, and provisions made for promoting the study of oriental languages. Reformatory canons.

1316–1334. John XXII. His *twenty Extravagantes* and *seventy-four Extravagantes Communes* are distributed in five books. The latter are received into the *Corpus Juris.* Louis of Bavaria (1313–1347) triumphs over his rival, Frederic of Austria (1322). Quarrel between Louis and John XXII. Benedict XII. (1334–1342) and Clement VI. (1342–1352.) Louis is excommunicated in 1324. An impassioned discussion ensues between Marsilius of Padua († 1328) and John of Jandun († after 1338). William Ockham († 1350); Leopold of Bamberg († 1354); Augustine Triumphus

(1328); Alvarus Pelagius († shortly after 1340); the Dominican, Durandus of St. Pourçain († 1333). Andronicus III. Palaeologus, Greek Emperor (1328–1341).

1338. Meeting of the Electors at Frankfort and Rhense. Nicholas de Lyra († 1341).

1346–1378. Charles IV., Emperor. Louis of Bavaria († 1347). Clement VI. (1342–1352) is succeeded by Popes Innocent VI. (1352–1362), Urban V. (1362–1370), and Gregory XI. (1370–1378.) Cola de' Rienzi, the tribune of the people, reëstablishes the Roman republic (1347). John Tauler († 1361). Henry Suso (*Amandus*) († 1365). Wickliffe disquiets England in 1360.

1377. The return of Gregory XI. to Rome, which is effected by the united efforts of the Franciscan, Pedro, St. Bridget, and St. Catharine of Siena. Petrarca († 1374). John Ruysbroch († 1381).

1378–1409. Papal Schism. Popes in Rome and Avignon at the same time.

1386. Baptism of Jagello, Grand-duke of Lithuania. Gerard Groot of Deventer, founder of the Clerics and Brothers of the Common Life († 1384). Nicholas de Clemange (1386) and Peter d'Ailly (1389) lecture in Paris. Henry of Hessia, or of Langenstein, lectures in Vienna (1384). Gerson becomes chancellor of the University of Paris in 1395.

1408. The Councils of London (1382) and Prague condemn the errors of Wickliffe. John Huss, preacher in the city of Prague, from 1402, joins the Wickliffites (c. 1406).

1409. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. are deposed by the Council of Pisa, which appoints Alexander V. (1409–1410) to be their successor. Alexander V. is not universally acknowledged, and the inevitable result is the increase of the hitherto existing evil—three Popes instead of two. Peter d'Ailly; Gerson.

1410–1437. Sigismund, Emperor; John XXIII., Pope (1410–1415). Huss in a no less violent than turbulent manner inveighs against the indulgence granted by the Pope to all who might engage in the crusade against Ladislaus of Naples. He writes a book entitled "*Tractatus de Ecclesia*," and is in consequence excommunicated. The writing of the book and the sentence of excommunication both took place in 1413.

1414–1418. *Ecumenical Council of Constance.* A protracted and animated discussion arises whether the Pope is superior to the Council or not. The three Popes, John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and Gregory XII., are deposed, and Martin V. is chosen as lawful Pope in their stead (1417–1431). John Huss is burnt at the stake on the 6th of July, 1415, being declared an obstinate heretic. Jerome of Prague shares a like fate on the 30th of May, 1416. Instead of a reformation "*in capite et membris*," Concordats are entered into with several nations; there are, however, several important canons bearing on general reform. St. Vincent Ferrer († 1419).

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1423. The Council of Pavia is transferred to Siena on account of a pestilence. The results of this Council are insignificant. The Hussites split into Calixtines and Taborites, after the death of Huss, in 1419. John Ziska († 1424). Peter d'Ailly, Archbishop of Cambrai († 1425); Gerson († 1429).

1431–1449. Eugene IV. enters into negotiations with the Greek Emperor, John VIII. Palaeologus, at Constantinople, Ferrara, and Florence (1425 –1448).

1431–1449. *Council of Basle.* It is continued by that of Ferrara, held in 1438, and that of Florence, in 1439. Strange conduct displayed at the Council of Basle. Nicholas of Cusa publishes his work "*De Concordantia Catholica;*" he breaks with the Basilians, as does also Aeneas Sylvius.

1438. Albert II., Emperor. Second Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. The death of Nicholas de Clemange occurs about this time.

1439–1448. John de Turrecremata and Nicholas of Cusa defend Eugene IV. in the diet of Electors and States-general. They again defend him in 1441. Nicholas of Cusa, for the third time, pleads the cause of the Pope, at Frankfort, in 1442. Emperor Frederic III. (1440–1493) and the majority of the princes declare in favor of the Pope and against the Council of Basle. The new diet, in 1446, is followed by the concordat of Aschaffenburg, in 1448.

1453. Capture of Constantinople by the Turks. A new impetus is given to the revival of classics by the fugitive Greeks, who at the same time, undermine the prevailing religious spirit. The most celebrated among them, Bessarion, formerly archbishop of Nice, dies in 1472, as Cardinal-bishop of Tusculum. Lorenzo Valla († 1457), Paolo Cortesio, Marsilio Ficino, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Pietro Pomponazzo, and Angelo Poliziano, are contemporaries. Hellenism produces its desired effect in the school of the Brothers of the Common Life in the Netherlands. Nicholas of Cusa († 1464), Rudolph Agricola, Erasmus, etc.

1458–1464. Aeneas Sylvius ascends the throne of St. Peter, as Pius II. He exerts his influence to arrest the further progress of the Turks in Europe, and with this end in view convokes a Council at Mantua (1459), which, however, is not attended by the wished-for results.

1464–1471. Pope Paul II. He is carried away by a love for pageantry and extravagance, but at the same time opposes the pagan tendency of the newly introduced studies. He persecutes Platina and Pomponio Leto, the disciple of Lorenzo Valla. In 1470, the epoch of the Jubilee is fixed at every twenty-fifth year. Thomas à Kempis dies in 1471.

1471–1484. Sixtus IV. John Goch († 1475) and John Wessel († 1481), reformers. In the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, Torquemada holds the position of inquisitor-general (1483–1498).

1484–1492. Innocent VIII. Jerome Savonarola comes to Florence in 1489.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1492–1503. Questionable pontificate of Alexander VI. Maximilian, Emperor from 1493 to 1519. Execution of Savonarola, at Florence (1498).

1500. Efforts of Bartolomé de Las Casas in America. The University of Wittenberg established in 1502.

1503–1513. The short pontificate of Pius III. is followed by the warlike reign of Julius II., who, though bent upon enlarging his territories, shows himself a rigid observer of the ecclesiastical spirit.

1510. Death of the great preacher, Gailer of Kaisersberg. Luther goes to Rome for the purpose of negotiating the affairs of his Order.

1512–1517. The Council of Pisa is followed by the *Fifteenth Ecumenical*, or Fifth General *Council* of Lateran, which is opened by Julius II., on the 10th of May, 1512. Austere views of the General of the Augustinians, Giles of Viterbo. Leo X., in his interview with Francis I., at Bologna, in 1515, contents himself with the conclusion of a concordat, and terminates the Council on March 16, 1517, whereupon, the general of the Dominicans, Thomas de Vio of Gaëta, shows signs of intense indignation, and predicts that the greatest evils would ensue.

1514–1517. Several very useful works, written with a view to aid the study of Holy Writ, and numerous translations of the entire Bible, especially in German appear about this time. Cardinal Ximenes († 1517), publishes his polyglot Bible.

III. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE COUNCILS HELD DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.[*]

PRINCIPAL SYNODS HELD IN IRELAND BEFORE THE EIGHTH CENTURY.[†]

Synod of St. Patrick at Armagh. Synod of Bishops: of St. Patrick, Auxilius, and Isserinus, held at Armagh, probably about 456. About the year 599, a synod was convened in some part of Leinster, in which it was decreed that the Archbishopric of Leinster should be annexed to the See of Ferns. Synod of Old Leighlin, convened to settle the Paschal controversy, A. D. 630; another synod on the same subject was held at Whitefield, in 633 or 634. Celebrated synod of Flan (Florent. Febhla), Archbishop of Armagh, held in 695 or 696, and attended by forty bishops.

IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

Toledo, 701. Nesterfield, 701. Rome, 703. Niddanum (Adderbourn), 705. Constantinople, 715, 716. Rome, 721, 732. Germany, 742. Liptinae, 743. Rome, 743. Soissons, 744. Frankish General Synod, 745. Rome, 745. Germany, 747. Cloveshove, 747. Düren, 748. Vermeria, 753. Quiercy and Mentz, 754. Constantinople, 754. Verneuil, 755. Compiègne, 757. Rome, 757. Constance, 758–759. Rome, 761. Aschaim, in Bavaria, 763. Attigny, 765. Gentilly, 767. Rome, 769. Dingolfingen and Reuching, in Bavaria, between 769–772. Genua, 772. Paderborn or Lippstadt, 780 or 785. Worms, 781. Ratisbon (?), 781. Attigny, 785. Worms, 786. *Nice* (*Seventh Ecumenical*), 787. Calchut, 787. Worms and Ingelheim, 787, 788. Narbonne. 788. Aix-la-Chapelle, 789. Ratisbon, 792. Great Synod of Frankfort, 794. Verulam, 794. Friuli, 796. Beeaneld, 797. Rome, 799. Aix-la-Chapelle, 799. Riesbach, Freisingen, Salzburg, Urgel, and Finchol, 799. Rome, Cloveshove, and Tours, 800.

IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

Aix-la-Chapelle, 802. Ratisbon, 803. Cloveshove, 803, 809. Salz, 804. Constantinople and Salzburg, 806–809. Aix-la-Chapelle, 809, 811. Constantinople, 812. Rheims, 813. Mentz, 813. Tours, 813. Châlons, 813. Constantinople, 814, 815. Celchyt, 816. Aix-la-Chapelle, 816, 817. Aix-la-Chapelle, Venice, Vannes, and Thionville, 818. Attigny, 822. Rome and Compiègne, 823. London, Cloveshove, Oslaveshlen, and Aix-la-Chapelle, between 816–825. Paris, 825. Ingelheim, Rome, and Mantua, 826, 827. Paris, 828, 829. Worms, 829. St. Denys, 829–832. Nimwegen, 831. Compiègne, 833. Thionville, 835. Ingelheim, 840. Fontenay, Aix-la-Chapelle, Bourges, Milan, and Germigny, between 841–843. Constantinople, 842. Lauriac, 843. Coulaines, 843. Thionville, 844. Verneuil, 844. Meaux, 845. Beauvais, 845. Paris, 846. Mentz, 847. Bretagne, 848. Rome, 848. Sedan, 848. Mentz. 848. Paris, 849. Quiercy, 849. Pavia, 850. Rome, 850. Mentz, 851. Cordova, 852. Rome, 853. Paris, 853. Soissons, 853. Quiercy, 853. Leon, 854. Valence, 855. Pavia, 855. Winchester, 855. Quiercy, 857, 858. Constantinople, 858 (twice). Langres, 859. Savonnières, 859. Aix-la-Chapelle, 860. Coblenz, 860. Tousi, 860. Milan, 860. Rome, 860. Constantinople, 861. Rome, 861. Soissons, 862. Aix-la-Chapelle, 862. Pistes (Pistres), 862. Metz, 863. Rome, 863, 864. Attigny, 865. Soissons, 866. Constantinople, 866, 867. Troyes, 867. Worms, 868. Rome, 869. *Constantinople* (*Eighth Ecumenical*), 869. Verheri and Metz, 869. Attigny, 870. Douzi, 871. Senlis, 873. Ravenna, 874. Douzi, 874. Pavia, 876. Rome, 876. Ravenna, 877. Rome, 877. Compiègne, 877. Oviedo, 877. Troyes, 878. Rome, 879. Constantinople, 879. Rome, 880, 881. Fimes, 881. Ravenna, 882. Toulouse, 883. Châlons, 886. Cologne, 886. Metz and Mentz, 888. Pavia, 889 or 890. Vienne, 892. Châlons, 894. Tribur, 895. England, 895. Rome, 896, 898. Ravenna, 898. Rheims and Rome, 900.

---

[*] For the sources, consult the collections of councils, both general and particular, by *Mansi*, *Harduin*, etc. Cf. also the works thereon by *Cabassutius*, *Hefele*, etc. See also literature, Vol. I., p. 22, note 1.

[†] Extracted from *Lanigan's* History. The statements of Irish synods down to the thirteenth century, supplemented in this table, are derived from the same source. (Tr.)

IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

Rome, 901. In the province of Narbonne, 902, 906, 907. Trosly, 909. Altheim, 916. Constantinople, 920. Trosly, 921. Coblenz, 922. Rheims, 922. Altheim, 931. Ratisbon, Erfurt, and Dingolfingen, 932. Soissons, 941. Laon, 948. Ingelheim, 948. Treves, 948. London, 948. Llandaff, 950. Augsburg, and Frankfort, 952. Llandaff, 955. Near Meaux, 962. Rome, 962, 963, 964. 967. Ravenna, 967, 968. England, 969. Canterbury, 969. Rome, 971. Compostella, 971. London, 971. Ingelheim, 972. Winchester, 975. Calne, 978. Llandaff, 988. Senlis, 988. Near Rheims, 991. Rome, 993. Italy, about 995. Mouson, 995. Rome, 996. St. Denys, 996. Pavia, 997. Rome, 998. Ravenna, 998. Magdeburg, 999.

IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Rome, 1001. Frankfort, 1001. Rome, 1002. Poitiers, 1004. Thionville and Constance, 1005. Frankfort, 1007. Encham, 1009. Mentz, 1011. Coblenz, 1012. Leon, 1012. Ravenna, 1014. Orleans, 1017. Pavia, 1020. Orleans, 1022. Seligenstadt, 1022. Poitiers, Mentz, 1023. Paris, 1024. Arras, 1025. Anse, 1025. Mentz, 1028. Charroux, 1028. Limoges, 1029, 1031. Bourges, 1031. Arles, 1034. Aquitaine, 1034. Lyons, 1034. St. Gilles (Egydi), 1042. Sutri, 1046. Rome, 1047, 1049. Rheims, 1049. Mentz, 1049. Rouen, 1049. Rome, 1050. Paris, 1050. Brione, 1050. Vercelli, 1050. Coyac, 1050. Rome, 1051, 1053. Bamberg, Ratisbon, Worms, 1052. Constantinople, 1053. Narbonne and Mentz, 1054. Rouen, 1055. Lisieux, 1055. Lyons, 1055. Florence, 1055. Tours, 1055.

Angers, 1055. Compostella, 1056. Toulouse, 1056. Rome, 1057. Melfi, 1059. Benevento, 1059. Rome, 1059, 1060. Yacca, 1060. Tours, 1060. Vienne, 1060. Osborn, 1062. Aradon and Rome, 1063. Châlons, 1063. Rome, 1065. London, 1065. Mantua, 1067. Gironne, 1068. Toulouse, 1068. Barcelona, 1068; again, 1068. Spain, 1068. Mentz, 1069. Normandy, 1070. Winchester, 1070. Mentz and Treves, 1071. Winchester, 1072. Rouen, 1072. Rome, 1073. Erfurt, 1073. Rouen, 1074. Mentz, 1074. Poitiers, 1074. Erfurt, 1074. Rome, 1075. Mentz, 1075. London, 1075. Rome, 1076. Worms, 1076. Tribur, 1076. Autun, 1077. Forchheim, 1077. Rome, 1078. Poitiers, 1078. Avignon, 1080. Bourgos, 1080. Brixen, 1080. Mentz, 1080. Lyons, 1080. Rome, 1080, 1081. Meaux, 1082. Rome, 1083, 1084. Lucca, 1085. Compiègne, 1085. Quedlinburg, Mentz, 1085. Benevento, 1087. Capua, 1087. Bordeaux, 1087. Rome, 1089 (twice). Melfi, 1089. Toulouse, 1090. Étampes, 1091. Benevento, 1091. Leon, 1091. Soissons, Compiègne, and Rheims, 1092. Troyes, 1093. Autun, Rheims, and Constance, 1094. Poitiers, 1095. Clermont, 1095. Piacenza, 1095. Tours, 1096. Nimes and Rouen, 1096. Bari, 1098. Saint Omer, 1099. Rome, 1099. Valence, 1100. Poitiers, 1100. Anse, 1100.

IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

Rome, 1102. London, 1102. Troyes, 1104. Paris, 1104. Lateran, 1105. Rheims, 1105. Thuringia, 1105. Florence, 1106. Guastalla, 1106. Jerusalem, 1107. Troyes, 1107. London, 1107, 1108. Rome, 1110. Clermont, Toulouse, 1110. St. Benoit, 1110. Feadh Mac Aengussa, 1111. Beauvais, 1112. Vienne, 1112. Lateran, 1112. Cologne, 1113. Gran, 1114. Windsor, 1114. Ceprano, 1114. Châlons, 1115. Cologne, 1115. Syria, 1115. Rheims, 1115. Lateran, 1116. Benevento, 1117. Capua, 1118. Rouen, Mans, Toulouse, 1118. Rath Breasail, 1118.[1] Rheims, 1119. Toulouse, 1119. Beauvais, 1120. Naplous, 1120. Soissons, 1121. Worms, 1122. *Lateran* (*Ninth Ecumenical*), 1123. Vienne, Chartres, Clermont, Beauvais, 1124. Westminster, 1125, 1126, 1127. Nantes, 1127. Troyes, Ravenna, and Rouen, 1128. Châlons, London, 1129. Clermont, Étampes, Würzburg, 1130. Mentz, Rheims, Linègne, 1131. Piacenza, 1132. Jouare, 1134. Pisa, Cashel, 1134.[2] London, Northumbria, 1136. London, 1138. *Lateran* (*Tenth Ecumenical*), 1139. Winchester, 1139. Constantinople, Antioch, Sens, 1140. Constantinople, 1143. Tuam, 1143.[3] Rome, Armagh, 1144. Vezelai, Chartres, 1146. Paris, Constantinople, 1147. Rheims, 1148. Treves, 1148. Augsburg, 1148. Holmpatrick, 1148.[4] Beaugenci, 1152. Kells, 1152.[5] Mellifont, 1157.[6] Brigh Mac-

---

[1] This synod decreed that (exclusive of Dublin) the dioceses of Ireland should be reduced to the number of twenty-four; twelve of these to be subject to Armagh, and twelve to Cashel.

[2] Held by Domnald O'Conaing, archbishop, and by the other bishops of Munster, who assisted at the consecration of the Metropolitan church.

[3] Under Muredach, archbishop, for the liberation of Roderic O'Connor, who was then held captive by Tiernan O'Rourke, for which purpose also the next Synod of Armagh, 1144, was convened.

[4] Held by Gelasius, archbishop of Armagh, and by Malachy, in order to procure the pallium for the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel.

[5] Under Cardinal *Paparo*, who, as legate of Pope Eugene III., divided Ire-

---

[6] Convoked for the purpose of consecrating the church of that place.

Thadlig,[1] Roscommon, 1158. Anagni, Pavia, Nazareth, Oxford, 1160. Toulouse, Lodi, 1161. Montpellier, 1162. Clane, 1162.[2] Tours, 1163. Rheims, Northampton, Clarendon, 1164. Aix-la-Chapelle, Lombres, Würzburg, 1165. Constanti-

---

land into four provinces and thirty-one dioceses. From the act of submission made by the Irish bishops to King Henry of England, during the pontificate of Alexander III., we learn the number and names of the archbishoprics and bishoprics of Ireland during the twelfth century, which are as follows: I. The Archbishopric of Armagh, with the eight suffragan sees of the Episcopus Charensis, Odanus, Chondorensis, Thuenensis, Rathbotensis, Cenevensis, Ardachadensis, and Cluencrardensis. II. The Archbishopric of Cashel, with the nine suffragan sees of the Episcopus Lismorensis, Ingmelleccensis, Arcmorensis, Lucapniarensis, Kildarensis, Waterfordensis, Ardferdensis, Rofensis, and Finabrensis. III. The Archbishopric of Dublin, with the five suffragan sees of the Episcopus Bistagnensis, Fernensis, Leighlinensis, Kindarensis, and Erupolensis. IV. The Archepiscopal See of Tuam, with the five suffragan sees of the Episcopus Kinfernensis, Kinlathensis, Maigonensis, Aelfinensis, and Achatkouvensis. Many of these episcopal sees can now no longer be identified. See Art. *Ireland*, in *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopædia, written by *Sparschuh.*

P. Pius Bonifac. Gams, in his *Series Episcoporum*, Ratisbon, 1873, resting on the authority of *Waraeus*, *Cotten*, *Thos. Walsh*, *Aug. Theiner*, etc., gives on pp. 204, sq., in alphabetical order, the following names and dates of their erection: 1. *Achonry*, (Arcadensis) s. *Lyney*, 1152; 2. *Ardagh* (Ardachadensis ep.), 1152; 3. *Armagh* (Armacanus), 445 (455); 4. *Cashel* (Cashelien.), archepisc., er. 1152; Sedes de *Emly*, c. 527, postea Cashel et Emly unitæ Sedes, c. 1567; 5. *Clogher* (Clogherensis), first bp., St. Maccartin, † 506, Episcopatus *Louth*, 534; 6. *Clonfert* (Clonfertensis), 558; 7. *Clonmacnois* (Cluenensis ep.), first bp., St. Kieran, discipulus S. Finniani, † 549; 8. *Cloyne* and *Ross* (Cloynen. et Rossen.), Cloyne fund. per St. Colman, c. 580; Ross fund. per S. Fachnan, c. 570; 9. *Cork* (Corgacensis ep.), 606; 10. *Derry* (Derrensis ep.), 1158; 11. *Down* and *Connor* (Dunen. et Conoren.), 499; 12. *Dromore* (Dromorensis ep.), c. 510; 13. *Dublin* (Glendalough), S. Keivin (Coemgen), † 618; 1166, sedit Kinad O'Ronan, Episcopi Dublinenses; 1038, sat Donatus (Dunan), a Dane, who built the Cathedral of the Most Blessed Trinity; 1074, Gilla [Patrici(an)us], consecrated by Lanfranc, archbp. of Canterbury; 14. *Elphin*, first bp. S. Asicus, c. 450; 15. *Enachdune* (Enagdunensis ep.), St. Meldan, in the 7th century; 1152; after 1484 united to Tuam; 16. *Ferns*, St. Aidan (Maidoc), † 632; 17. *Kerry* (Ardfertensis, ep.), Dermod. Mac Maël Brenan, † 1075; 18. *Kildare-Leighlin* (Kildarien. et Leighlin.) (St. Bridget, 490), St. Coulaeth, † 519; 19. *Killala* (Alladensis), S. Muredach, tempore S. Columba, Kellach, occis. c. 544, Muredach, † c. 590; O'Maelfogomair, ep. de Tirawley et O'Fiachra, † 1151; 20. *Killaloe* (Laonensis ep.), c. 640–650, St. Flañan; 21. *Kilmacduagh* and *Kilfenora* (Finaboren. et Duacen.), St. Colman, before 620; 22. *Kilmore* (Kilmoren), (Brefny, Brefinia, Triburna), 1136; 23. *Leighlin* and *Kildare* (Leighlinensis ep.), 626, St. Gobban erects the Abbey of Leighlin, and a synod is held there, A. D. 630; c. 632, St.

---

[1] (Co. Meath) held to promote ecclesiastical discipline. Derry made a regular episcopal see.

[2] Held by Gelasius of Armagh, for the promotion of discipline and morals.

nople, London, 1166. Lateran, 1167. Gran, 1169. Armagh, 1170.[1] Cashel, 1172.[2] Avranches, 1172. Tuam, 1172.[3] London, 1175. Waterford, 1175.[4] Venice, 1177. Dublin, 1177.[5] *Lateran* (*Eleventh Ecumenical*), 1179. Caen, 1182. Verona, 1184. Paris, 1185. London, 1185. Dublin, 1186.[6] Paris, 1188. Rouen, 1190. Mentz, 1191. Montpellier, 1195. York, 1195. Bamberg, 1196. Paris, 1196. Sens, 1198. Dijon, 1199. Vienne, 1199. Dioclea, in Dalmatia. London, 1200. Dublin (c. 1200).[7]

IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

Soissons, 1201. Paris, 1201. Meaux and Antioch, 1204. Laval, near Mans, 1207. Avignon and Paris, 1209. St. Gilles, 1209. Rome, 1210. Montpellier and Arles, 1211. Paris, 1212, 1213. Lavaur, 1213. London, 1213, 1214. Rouen and Bourges, 1214. *Lateran* (*Twelfth Ecumenical*), 1215. Paris, 1215. Montpellier, 1215. Melun, 1216. Gisors, 1218. Salzburg, 1219. Nice, by Schismatical Greeks, 1220. Oxford, 1222. Slesvig, 1222. Erfurt, 1223. Hildesheim, 1224. Montpellier, 1224. Mentz, Bourges, Melun, 1225. Paris, 1226. Cremona, 1226. Narbonne, 1227. Treves, 1227. Rome, 1228. Paris, 1229. Toulouse, 1229. Tarragona, 1229. Mentz and Würzburg, 1230. Noyon, 1233. Mentz, 1234. Arles, 1234. Béziers, 1234. Narbonne, Senlis, Rheims, Compiègne, 1235. Tours, Bourgos, 1236. London, 1237. Treves, 1238. Tours, 1239. Worcester, 1240. *Lyons* (*Thirteenth Ecumenical*), 1245. Lerida, 1246.

Laserian founded the episcopal see and † 639; 24. *Limerick* (Limiricensis ep.), 1106; 25. *Lismore* and *Waterford* (Waterfordien. et Lismorien.), St. Cartagh establishes the see in 633; 26. *Meath* (Midensis), 520, St. Finnian first bp. of Clonard, 1174, Eugene first bp. of Meath; 27. *Ossory* (Ossoriens.), St. Kiaran 538; 28. *Raphoë* (Rathbotensis, ep.); 29. *Tuam* (Tuamensis ep.), St. Jarlath, † c. 540, archbp. 1152; 30. *Mayo*, c. 665, 670, 1578, Bp. Patr. O'Hely, † a martyr of the faith, and the see was united to Tuam; 31. *Waterford* (Waterfordien.), erected 1095. (Tr.)

---

[1] By this synod, all the English, who were detained in servitude in Ireland were restored to liberty.

[2] Convened by order of Henry II., to regulate ecclesiastical discipline. Neither the primate, nor any of his suffragans, assisted at this synod.

[3] Provincial synod, under Archbishop Cadla O'Dubhai. Three churches were consecrated by the bishops who assembled on this occasion.

[4] In this meeting of bishops, the bull of Hadrian IV. to Henry II. and the confirmatory brief of Alexander III. to the same prince, were, for the first time, publicly read in Ireland.

[5] Under *Vivian*, legate for Ireland, Scotland, etc., who set forth Henry's right to the sovereignty of Ireland, in virtue of the Pope's authority, and inculcated the necessity of obeying him under the pain of excommunication.

[6] The object was church discipline, ecclesiastical ceremonies. Confirmed by Pope Urban III.

[7] Under Matthew O'Henry, archbishop of Cashel and legate, who confirmed the donations made by Prince John to Cumin, archbishop of Dublin, and the union of the See of Glendalough to Dublin.

Béziers, 1246. Cologne, 1247. Paris, Breslau, and Valence, 1248. Utrecht, 1249. Tarragona and Saumur, 1253. Albi, 1254. Paris and Bordeaux, 1255. Sens, 1256. Compiègne and Gran, 1256. Lanciez, in Silesia, 1257. Ruffec, near Poitiers, and Merton, in England, 1258. Fritzlar, 1259. Arles, 1260. Cognac, 1260. Cologne, 1260. Paris, 1260. London, Mentz, 1261. Ravenna, 1261. Paris, 1263. Nantes, 1264. Northampton and Westminster, 1265. Cologne, Bremen, 1266. Vienna, 1267. Breslau, 1268. London, 1268. Sens and Bourges, 1269. Salzburg, 1274. *Lyons* (*Fourteenth Ecumenical*), 1274. Constantinople, 1275. Bourges, 1276. Saumur, 1276. Constantinople, 1277. Compiègne, 1278. Langres, 1278. Angers, 1279. Béziers, Avignon, Reading, and Ofen (Buda), 1279. Cologne, 1280. Constantinople, 1280. Paris, 1281. Salzburg, 1281. Lambeth, 1281. Avignon, Tarragona, Tours, and Saintes, 1282. Constantinople, 1283. Blaquère, 1283. St. Poelten, Melfi, 1284. Riez and Lanciez, 1285. Bourges, 1286. Ravenna, 1286. London, 1286. Rheims, 1287. Milan, 1287. Würzburg, German National Council, 1287. Exeter-Rheims, and Milan, 1287. Salzburg and Lille, 1288. Chester, 1289. Paris, Westminster, and Nogaret, 1290. Milan, 1291. Salzburg and Aschaffenburg, 1291. Tarragona, Bremen, and Aschaffenburg, 1292. Béziers and Grado, 1296. London, 1297. Rouen and Béziers, 1299. Melun, Salzburg, and Merton, 1300.

IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

Rheims, 1301. Rome, Paris, Pennafiel, 1302. Paris, 1303 (Assembly in the Louvre). Compiègne, 1304. Armenian Unionist Synod, at Sis, 1307. Presburg, 1309. Paris, Salzburg, Treves, Cologne, and Mentz, 1310. London, Ravenna, and Bergamo, 1311. *Vienne* (*Fifteenth Ecumenical*), 1311–1312. London and Tarragona, 1312. Ravenna, Paris, and Saumur, 1314. Senlis, 1315. Nougarot and Magdeburg, 1315. Mentz, 1316. Tarragona, Ravenna, and Bologna, 1317. Sens, 1320. Magdeburg, Cologne, and Valladolid, 1322. Paris, Toledo, 1324. Avignon, Senlis, Alcala de Henarez, and Mariac, 1326. Ruffec, 1327. Compiègne, 1329. Tarragona and Benevento, 1331, 1332. Cologne, 1333. Paris, Rouen, 1334. Salamanca, 1335. Avignon, 1337. Treves, 1338. Aquileia, 1339. Freisingen, 1340. London, and Armenian Synod, at Sis, 1342. Prague, 1343. Kalbe, in the territory of Magdeburg, and Spalato, in Dalmatia, 1344. Constantinople, 1351. Béziers, 1351. Cologne and Eichstädt, 1353, 1354. Canterbury, 1362. Lambeth, 1362. Angers, 1366. York, 1367. Lavaur, 1368. Salamanca, 1371. London, 1372. Valence, 1376. Prague, 1381. London, 1382. Salzburg, 1386. Capua, 1391. Paris, 1392. London, 1396. Paris, 1398.

IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

At London, 1401–1403, three Councils. Paris, 1404, 1405. Prague, 1405. Hamburg and Würzburg, 1407. Perpignan, 1408. Paris, 1408. Oxford, 1408. *Pisa,* 1409. Aquileja, 1409. Salamanca, 1410. Seville, 1412. Rome, 1413. London, 1413. *Constance* (*Sixteenth Ecumenical*), 1414–1418. Salzburg, 1418, 1420. Cologne and Treves, 1423. Pavia and Siena, 1423. Copenhagen, 1425. Paris, 1429 Tortosa, 1429. Riga, 1429. *Basle,* 1431–1439. Bourges, 1431, 1438 (diet). *Ferrara,* 1438. Frankfort, 1438. *Florence,* (*Seventeenth Ecumenical*), 1439. Mentz, 1439. Freisingen, 1440. Rouen, 1445. Angers, 1446–

1448. Lausanne, 1449. Constantinople, 1450. Mentz, Bamberg, and Salzburg, 1451. Cologne, 1452. Soissons, 1455. Avignon, 1457. Sens, 1459. Mentz, 1459. Constance and Eichstädt, 1463–1465. Toledo, 1473. Madrid, 1473. Aranda, 1473. Freisingen, Constance, and Breslau, 1475–1480. Tournay, Constance, Eichstädt, Bamberg, and Salzburg, 1481–1491. Sens, 1485. London, 1486. Camin, 1492. Treves, 1495. Ermeland and Breslau, 1497.

IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Camin, 1500. Meissen, 1504. Magdeburg, Bamberg, Breslau, and Petricow, 1505–1510. Tours, 1510. Pisa and Milan, 1511. *Lateran* (*Seventeenth Ecumenical*), 1512–1517. Florence, 1517.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

The following additions and corrections were forwarded by the Author to the Translators too late for insertion in their proper place:

Page 17, line 14 from bottom, after the words fourteenth century add: concerning Sturleson, the eminent statesman of Iceland, cf. *Gfrörer*, Pope Gregory VII., Vol. II., p. 527 sq.

Page 104, line 16 from bottom, read: During the first half of the ninth century, Reginbert founded an extensive library.[3]

Page 106, after bottom line add: *Dümmler*, Supplem. to a Hist. of the Archd. of Salzburg from the 9th to the 12th century, Vienna, 1860.

Page 108, add to first line from bottom: *Hennet*, Hist. of the Archbishops of Mentz, *ibid.* 1867.

Page 125, line 19 from top, add after Schaffh. 1865: *Sohn*, Jurisdiction of the clergy in the Frankish Empire, Tübg. 1870. Ancient Private and Public Law of Germany, Weimar, 1871, Vol. I.

Page 138, line 5 from the bottom, after (Comment. in Joan., c. 13), add the following: "Petrus specialiter Principatum judiciariae potestatis accepit, ut omnes per orbem credentes intelligant, quia quicunque ab unitate fidei vel societatis illius quolibet modo semetipsos segregant, tales nec vinculis peccatorum absolvi nec januam possint regni coelestis ingredi." Hom. II. 16. *Migne*, Ser. lat., T. 94, p. 223.

Page 171, line 7 from bottom, after A. D. 799 add: *Einhard*, Charlemagne's biographer, was educated under the care of Alcuin, in the Palatine school, and, by his ability and acquirements, won the esteem and favor of the emperor, by whom he was appointed private secretary (*scriba adjuratus*) and superintendent of public works, or, more correctly, supervising architect. He was the emperor's inseparable companion. On the death of the latter, Einhard was made preceptor to Lothaire, son of Louis the Mild, and, being a skillful architect, still managed to retain much of his former influence. He was for many years lay-abbot of various monasteries, but finally, tiring altogether of secular life, lived a secluded life at the out-of-the-way town of Mühlheim, where he built a monastery, and changed the name of the place from Mühlheim to *Seligenstadt* (City of the Blessed). After agreeing with his wife, Emma, that they should henceforth regard one another only as brother and sister, he became a monk, and died abbot of a monastery (P. A. D. 848).[2] (This [2] is transferred from line 10, and the corresponding note, by oversight, omitted at the proper place, is as follows:)

[2] Cf. the Life and Writings of *Paulus Diaconus* (*Pertz*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Vol. X., p. 247–414). *Abel*, Paulus Diaconus and the other Lombard

Historians (Historians of German antiquity, in German, Berlin, 1849). *Stillbauer*, The Life of Eginhard, Seligenstadt, 1872. The *Catholic*, year 1872, in the May number, "The Remains of Einhard," etc.

Page 173, line 11 from bottom, should read: *Alcuin*, opp. cura Frobenii abbatis ad St. Emmeranum.

Page 224, after line 16 from bottom add: *Von Jensen*, Ch. Hist. of Slesvig-Holstein, edited by *Michelsen*, Kiel, 1873.

Page 241, line 9 from bottom, for 1860, Vol. I., read: 1860–70, Vol. V.; and in the next line add: *Wattenbach*, The Slavic Liturgy of Bohemia, etc., Breslau, 1857.

Page 243, line 4 from bottom, for 1864–1866, 2 vols., read: 1864–1872, 3 vols.; and add: By the *same*, Hist. of the Bishops and Archbishops of Prague, being a Memorial for the Celebration of the Ninth Centennial of the See of Prague, *Ibid.* 1873.

Page 244, line 12 from top, before the words, *He had*, insert: Aided by the advances made by Wolfgang, Bishop of Ratisbon.

Page 246, place first in the *literature* of § 182: Monumenta Poloniae historica, ed. *Białowski*, Lemberg, 1875, 2 vols.

Ibid., to last line at bottom add: *Zeisberg*, Polish Historiography during the M. A., Lps. 1873.

Page 284, line 5 from bottom, after T. V., p. 691, insert: *Maasmeiner*, Oration of Pope Hadrian II., 869, or First Extensive Use of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, Vienna, 1873.

Page 326, lines 11 and 12 from top to be stricken out, and the following substituted: The belief is daily gaining ground, that the words included within parentheses are an interpolation of the *imperialist* party, and if this be true, it is probable that the decree given further on, at page 329, and supposed to date from 1061, is the original one.

Ibid., lines 14–18, within parentheses, thus: (*provided*—impaired.)

Page 408, line 11 from bottom, after the words, *on naked altars*, insert: and before veiled crucifixes.

Page 416, line 6 from top, where Christ is represented as a popular leader and mighty prince, insert: as "*Droste*" as governor; the Apostles as "*Recken*," or heroes, and Peter as a remarkably shrewd old gentleman.

To the corresponding foot-note, commencing *Heliand*, add, after the words M. *Heyne*, Paderborn, 1866: By the *same*, with an exhaustive glossary, Paderborn, 1873.

Page 421, line 7 from top, after the word *hymns*, add: sequences; and to the corresponding foot-note add: †*Kehrein*, Latin Sequences of the M. A., collected from Manuscripts and Prints, Mentz, 1873.

Page 480, line 3 from top, after ed. *Watts*, Lond. 1640, add: ed. *Luard*, London, 1875, 2 vols.

Page 481, line 3 from top, after *Jaffé*, Regesta Rom. Pontif., p. 402 sq., add: Continued by *Potthast* from 1198 to 1304.

Ibid., line 9 from bottom, add: *Montalembert*, St. Gregoire VII. (Correspondant of 1875 in several articles.) The same, in *The Month* of 1875. Translated into English. (Tr.)

Page 501, continue last line at bottom: Leo calls the event a triumph gained